

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127143
Title of the Manuscript:	Harnessing natural arsenal for effective management of jassid on brinjal [Solenum melongena L.]
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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.	This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community as it presents sustainable, biopesticide-based approaches for managing jassid infestations in brinjal, a crucial crop. By highlighting the effectiveness of natural treatments like Azadirachtin and Lecanicillium lecanii, the study contributes to environmentally friendly pest management practices, reducing reliance on synthetic insecticides. The research also offers practical insights into integrated pest management (IPM), supporting agricultural productivity while minimizing ecological impact. I appreciate the manuscript for its focus on sustainable agriculture and for offering scientifically tested alternatives that benefit both farmers and ecosystems.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Objective Clarity: Adding a brief introductory sentence on the purpose of the study (e.g., testing biopesticide efficacy for sustainable jassid management) would set the stage better. Specific Findings: Mentioning the statistical significance of the results could strengthen the impact of the findings. Implications for IPM: Including a brief note on how these findings support integrated pest management (IPM) approaches in sustainable agriculture would emphasize the study's relevance.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, as it follows a systematic experimental approach to evaluate the effectiveness of biopesticides against jassid on brinjal. The study spans two years, which strengthens the reliability of the findings by accounting for potential seasonal variations in pest populations. Additionally, the use of multiple biopesticide treatments, including controls, and repeated observations across multiple days after each spray, indicates thoroughness in methodology. By including both statistical and comparative analyses, the authors effectively demonstrate the superiority of Azadirachtin and Lecanicillium lecanii, lending credibility to their conclusions on sustainable pest management.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hafiz Tanvir Ahmad
Department, University & Country	The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan