

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_127487
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Thrips Infestation in Mung bean: Integrated Control with Chemical and Neem-Based Treatments</b>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Idea of study is proper. In this work, the authors proposed an interesting study in using some different chemical insecticides and neem oil to manage thrips in mung bean field. The findings of this study suggested that the Talstar 2WP was the most effective insecticide against Thrips infestation on mung bean. Some details must be revised, but the work is supported by the results and the proper literature. In my opinion, biological or natural compounds should be used and compared with a chemical compound.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but it need to be modified. I suggest to be: Integrated control of thrips in mung beans with treatments of some insecticides and neem oil.	
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.	Need to be more clear and exhibit more results. Prefer to be one unit.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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 manuscript is well written, technically correct, and follows the expected article structure. Results obtained are relevant for the research field with an important contribution increase yield. The results are relevant and obtained according to the expected experimental design with accuracy, supporting the conclusions. But this type of study requires a lot of discussion with previous studies, whether they agree or contradict them.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The author must support the results with a lot of discussion.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	Hamdi Shaaban Abd El-Karim
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Research Center, Egypt