

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_119194
Title of the Manuscript:	Field efficacy of certain chemicals and neem products against shoot and fruit borer, <i>Earias vittella</i> (Fabricius.) on okra in Prayagraj, U.P.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This article provides important information concerning the field efficacy of certain chemicals and neem products against shoot and fruit borer, <i>Earias vittella</i> (Fabricius.) on okra in Prayagraj, U.P.; 2. The title is adequate to the content of the article; 3. The abstract of the article is well written, adequately explains the research setting and issues; 4. The Introduction not gives a suitable description of the addressed problem and it not shows the significance of the research problem, is scientifically limited. The methodology used is appropriate to the purpose of the research; The results are interesting and important to researchers in relevant fields of agriculture, but for the publication of this study, I recommend supplementing it with other determinations to support its importance and opportunity; 5. The purpose or goal of the work is within the journal's scope. I recommend relating the results obtained from this study to other similar studies, a very important aspect to support the results obtained; 6. The number of references is limited and some corrections need to be made. I recommend the inclusion of a larger number of more recent studies on the subject and their insertion in bibliographic references; <p>However, corrections should be made in order to publish the article. Please, take into account the following recommendations to improve this manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The general presentation of the manuscript should be reviewed, the extra spaces between words or the lack of spaces between titles, subtitles, table and text according to the requirements of the journal; - I recommend a revision of the manuscript according to the requirements of the journal (English, technical editing, bibliography, etc.); - I recommend a critical approach to the literature to enable analysis and interpretation of the information, development of an objective viewpoint and the setting of clear objectives; - The presentation of the results obtained from this study is very short, without reference to other studies with similar results and I recommend a review of this issue; - I recommend editing the table according to the settings imposed by the journal (they exceed the page settings); - I recommend that conclusions be formulated highlighting the importance of the results obtained; - The presentation of the Conclusions is very short; - I recommend including more recent bibliographic references. <p>Based on the above mentioned, I recommend this paper for publication after performing the suggested corrections.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I recommend a carefully check of the full manuscript to correct any grammatical or syntax error.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Daniela Stoin
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences "King Michael I" from Timisoara, Romania