

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_119651
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Micronutrients on Incidence, Damage Severity of Sucking Insect Pests of Sunflower and Its Impact on Yield and Other Arthropods
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>

Review Form 1.7

<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is indeed relevant to the scientific audience and this is the more reason why it should undergo a thorough review. 2. The title is suitable but may need a little modification. 3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. It lacks a brief background of topic, aim of study, conclusion and recommendation. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript have so much of appropriateness. It has some relevant subsections/subheading that were omitted. The author(s) may need to reconcile these subsections. 5. The manuscript is not scientifically correct. It contains a lot of scientific inconsistencies and discontinuities that that need to be addressed. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. I think number of references is okay. I am wondering why the author(s) have not been able to present a good justification of the trend of results obtained in this study. 7. Apart from above mentioned 6 points, I also think that the author(s) require some kind of academic mentoring/coaching to improve their level of applicability of scientific concepts and theories to identifying research gaps. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. There are so many grammatical errors and discontinuities in several cases. This manuscript requires thorough English editing.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>It appears that the manuscript must undergo serious major revision before it can be considered for publication.</p> <p>In my opinion, I would want the author(s) to note the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maps/some background needed. It appears strange to me that the map of the study location and/or sites where the data were collected is not included. 2. The study lacks a solid purpose, other than analyzing the incidence of insect pests. 3. This is reflected in the presentation of the results, which does not provide a lot of information that would be useful for planning and design to reduce the impact on yield of Sunflower. 4. It is necessary to provide some evidence, say agricultural production amount from Sunflower cultivation, to argue the scientific worth and usefulness of the present results. 5. A physical explanation or discussions about the present results will enhance the significance of this study. 6. The presentation and writing style need significant improvement. 7. The vast majority of the bulk of the paper is not substantive, but instead contains unreferenced, non-scientific descriptive narratives that do not add to its scientific impact. 8. Acceptance of this manuscript for publication is contingent upon the ability of the author(s) to satisfactorily address the concerns and suggestions of the reviewers. 9. Along with their revision, the author(s) upload a point-by-point response that satisfactorily addresses the concerns and suggestions of comments. 10. As you would conduct a dialog with someone else, insert your responses in a different font, different font style, or different color after each comment. 11. If you have made a change to the manuscript, please indicate where in the manuscript the change has been made. <p>As I conclude, questions remain on the authors' choice of analysis, interpretation of the results and use of language (grammatical errors)</p> <p>In-text citations should be arranged in a sequential order</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Denis M. K. Amara
Department, University & Country	Njala University, Sierra Leone