

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_126220
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Different Insecticides Against Aphids, Aphis craccivora Koch Infesting Dolichos Bean
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of different insecticides against aphids in dolichos beans, which is essential for developing sustainable pest management strategies in legume crops. By highlighting Diafenthiuron as the most effective treatment, the study offers a potential solution for farmers facing aphid infestations, which can severely impact crop yields.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article could be clearer and more specific. Currently, it does not convey the specific focus on aphid management in dolichos beans or highlight the comparative assessment of various insecticides. A more suitable title might be: "Evaluation of Insecticides for Effective Management of Aphids (Aphis craccivora Koch) in Dolichos Bean (Lablab purpureus L.) During the Rabi Season"	
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.	Begin with a brief statement on the study's purpose, such as: "This study aimed to evaluate the efficacy of various insecticides against aphid infestation in dolichos beans." Include a brief mention of the statistical analysis used (if any), as this adds credibility to the reported results. Add a sentence on the significance of this research for integrated pest management (IPM) or sustainable agriculture. This will highlight its relevance to the scientific community. If relevant, briefly mention why the untreated control was essential for assessing the effectiveness of treatments.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, with clear sections for the Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion, which follow a standard scientific format. However, the Results and Discussion section could be further divided to separate the findings from the interpretation, making it easier for readers to follow the flow of information.	
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 to be scientifically robust, as it follows a well-defined experimental design with appropriate replication and controls, which strengthens the reliability of its findings. The use of multiple insecticide treatments and untreated control provides a thorough comparison, allowing for a more accurate assessment of each insecticide's effectiveness. The data collection methodology, particularly the systematic recording of aphid populations across multiple days after each spray, demonstrates attention to detail and consistency.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The manuscript includes relevant references, but several are somewhat outdated, with many cited studies from the 1990s and early 2000s. Adding more recent references from the past five years would strengthen the paper by providing updated insights into current insecticide efficacy and resistance trends, as well as advancements in sustainable pest management practices.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, as it effectively conveys the study's purpose, methods, and findings. However, there are minor grammatical errors and instances of repetitive phrasing that could be improved for clarity and conciseness. Streamlining complex sentences and ensuring consistent terminology would enhance readability and professionalism. A final proofread or editing pass would help polish the manuscript, ensuring it meets high standards for academic publication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Here are some critical points for improvement in your manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. While the manuscript mentions percentages and mean aphid counts, it lacks specific statistical tests or confidence intervals to support the significance of the results. Including ANOVA or other statistical tests would strengthen the reliability of the data.2. The manuscript uses terms like "aphid index," "mean number of aphids per three leaves," and "aphid population" interchangeably. Consistent terminology would enhance clarity, especially for readers unfamiliar with the study's specific terminology.3. Several sections, such as the results for the first and second sprays, repeat similar findings for different days after spraying. Summarizing or condensing this information in a comparative table or figure would make it more concise.4. Given the focus on insecticides, it would be valuable to discuss the environmental and ecological implications of each insecticide, especially Diafenthiuron and Imidacloprid, which may pose risks to non-target organisms.5. The manuscript does not provide justification for why each insecticide was selected. Briefly explaining the reason for selecting each treatment based on prior research or pest resistance trends could provide useful context.6. The focus is solely on chemical insecticides. Mentioning or discussing integrated pest management (IPM) practices would give a more comprehensive approach to pest control and could align with sustainable agricultural practices.7. The literature review mainly lists previous studies without synthesizing or comparing findings, which would give a more cohesive background on the efficacy of different insecticides against aphids.8. Since resistance to traditional insecticides is mentioned, more detail on how resistance was measured or assessed for the insecticides used would improve the relevance of the findings.9. The manuscript would benefit from a section discussing potential limitations of the study, such as environmental conditions that may have affected aphid populations, and suggesting directions for future research to address these. <p>Incorporating these improvements could strengthen the manuscript by making it more comprehensive, clearer, and aligned with current research practices in pest management.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	S. Sumaiya Parveen
Department, University & Country	Karunya Institute of Technology and Sciences, India