

**Review Form 3**

JournalName:	<b>InternationalJournalof Plant&amp;SoilScience</b>
ManuscriptNumber:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_121010</b>
TitleoftheManuscript:	<b>InterplayofAbioticFactorsonVariousPhytophagousBeetlesinCucumberUnderDifferentAgro-ClimaticConditions.</b>
TypeoftheArticle	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that an author should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is well written, interesting, brings up a subject of importance for cucumber cultivation, and could be useful to the region and other locations.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract does not present methodology and objective.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>No. I suggest the author change it.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>As previously stated, the subject is important and current, in addition the manuscript is well written and provides relevant information about the interaction of insects with the environment.</p>	
<p>Are there references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Although there are recurrent references, I suggest the author look for others, as around 50% of the references are more than 13 years old. I believe that there are authors with more recurrent studies regarding the insects studied.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>There are some observations and suggestions in the text.</p> <p>Introduction: There is no objective in the introduction.</p> <p>Materials and methods: The author did not inform about the black beetle.</p> <p>Results: Regarding the black beetle, the author only presented the results, without corroborating them.</p> <p>Conclusion: In this item the author presents the behavior of beetles on plants (canopy and foliage), which are actually very interesting, but he did not mention it in the material and methods, nor did he present the data from this survey in the results.</p> <p>References: I suggest that the author checks the journal's rules and standardizes the references, as the initials of the names sometimes have a period and sometimes not; sometimes the initials are before the surname, sometimes after; sometimes with space, sometimes without.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maria da Graça de Souza Lima</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Brasil</b>