

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_120978
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact Assessment of Integrated Pest Management technology on Kharif Paddy cultivation in Vidarbha region of Maharashtra State
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The paper addresses an important issue for the scientific community, which is the analysis of a certain pest control strategy in agricultural paddy production. The authors collect data from local producers and, based on them, carry out a descriptive analysis that seeks to elucidate the main gains of that strategy, as well as relate its use to certain intrinsic characteristics of the producers. Based on their work, strategies to encourage increased pest control productivity could be designed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is appropriate in my perception.	
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.	The abstract is understandable, however, it presents details that could be omitted or sent to another section as an introduction, for example. It would be more interesting to just leave a summary of the main contributions of the work, instead of methodological details.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I agree with the structure of the manuscript organization into sections.	
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.	The authors basically perform a descriptive analysis, without many methodological challenges. I don't see any error from this perspective. However, I think the paper can be improved in two directions. First, when analyzing the data, the authors could try to extract more interpretative information – in my opinion, they excessively described results that already appeared in the tables, for example. The work would certainly be more attractive if the authors discussed the political impacts of their empirical findings. Finally, the authors should explain the weighting system they chose when using principal component analysis. Why is their approach better than using the first principal component?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There is a lack of methodological references on Principal Component Analysis (perhaps books on multivariate analysis such as "Richard A. Johnson and Dean W. Wichern, 2007, Applied Multivariate Statistical Analysis, Springer" and similars).	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is well written.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Wilson Calmon Almeida dos Santos
Department, University & Country	Institute of Mathematics and Statistics, Fluminense Federal University, Brazil