

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_98533
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Entomopathogenic Fungi for the Biocontrol of Sucking Insect Pest: Pertaining to Red Spider Mites (<i>Tetranychus urticae</i>)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is very important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable but the phrase (sucking insect Pest) which mentioned in it must be changed to sucking insect Pests.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive but the outlines of it must be deleted.</p> <p>4- Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>7. The references are sufficient and most of them are recent but four references are very old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General comments</p> <p>1. In the text the word per cent must be changed to percent because it is one word.</p> <p>2. Material and methods must be corrected to materials and methods.</p> <p>3. Various concentration which mentioned under 2.1 must be corrected to various concentrations.</p> <p>4. The word respectively must be written in the end of the two phrases mentioned below and mentioned under 3.1 in the text. Among the <i>Beauveria</i> isolates, ENPF-16 caused the highest percent mortality (10 and 33.33 percent) on 5th and 7th days after treatment. The statistically highest (95.33 and 93.33 %) mortality was observed in the leaf discs dipped in the spore suspension of <i>Hirsutella</i> isolate ENPF-58 and <i>Isaria</i> isolate ENPF-8 on the ninth day after treatment (Table 1).</p> <p>5. The LC₅₀ and LC₉₀ values for <i>Isaria</i> sp. and for <i>Hirsutella</i> sp. on the 7th day and 9th day after treatment must be reviewed in the text under 3.2.</p> <p>6. (Tables 1, 2 and 3) must be written more than once in the text.</p> <p>7. The three tables and the only one figure must be mentioned before the references.</p> <p>8. Nadeau et al., 1996 and Van, 2007 which mentioned in the text must be changed to Nadeau and Boisvert., 1996 and Van et al., 2007 respectively.</p> <p>9. The reference: (BRAGA, G. U. L., FLINT, S. D., MESSIAS, C. L., ANDERSON, A. J. AND ROBERTS, D.W., 2001, Effect of UV-B on conidia and germlings of the entomopathogenic hyphomycete <i>Metarhizium anisopliae</i>. Mycol. Res., 105: 874-882.) should not appear in the text.</p> <p>10. Seiedy <i>et al.</i> (2015) which mentioned in the text should not appear in the reference list.</p> <p>11. The references in reference list are written capitalized.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mukhtar Abdel Aziz Mohamed Osman
Department, University & Country	University of Dongola, Sudan