

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_100097
Title of the Manuscript:	"Efficacy of selected insecticides against shoot and fruit borer, <i>Earias vittella</i> (Fabricius.) on okra"
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>It is indeed important as <i>Earias vitella</i> is an important pest not only in okra but also on cotton crop. Hence its management is of utmost concern. The authors have also tested botanicals, biopesticides, new insecticide molecules besides synthetic pesticide. Although Deltamethrin has proved effective but others have also done moderately good. Therefore, if one chooses not to opt for chemicals, can go for the use of spinosad or neem as mentioned in the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes but can be improved</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Few references are missing in the list of cited references in the end and few are missing from the text while mentioned in the list. Shirale et al (year is missing) and Shinde et al (2011) are missing in the list while Nalini & Kumar (2009) and Panbude et al. (2019) are missing in the text. Few references have been written incompletely</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Needs improvement	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are a lot of mistakes in the manuscript which I have marked there. These need to be incorporated. Also I have raised certain queries through comments which need to be addressed.</p> <p>There is no need to write the scientific names full everytime.</p> <p>The paper can be accepted only after incorporating all the changes as suggested and mentioned</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aditi Badiyala
Department, University & Country	CSK HPKV, India