

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_116830 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | “Comparative efficacy and economics of selected chemicals and biopesticides against pod borer [<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (Hubner)] on chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.)” |
| Type of the 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>1- The manuscript is very important for scientific community.</p> <p>2- The title of the article is not suitable. An alternative title is (Comparative efficacy and economics of selected insecticides against pod borer [<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (Hubner)] on chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.)</p> <p>3- The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4- Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5- I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6- The references in the manuscript are sufficient and recent.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>1- Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Optional/General comments:</p> <p>1- The objectives of the research should be written in the end of the introduction.</p> <p>2- The sentence (among all the treatment) which has been mentioned in the two lines, ninth and tenth of the introduction, must be corrected to (among all the treatments).</p> <p>3- The climate of the situation which has been mentioned in the materials and methods needs to reference.</p> <p>4- When the year of publication of any reference has been placed between two Parentheses in the text do not place comma before it.</p> <p>5- All results must be discussed. Consistency and relationship of the results with previous researches must be discussed. Practical impact and implications on future researches should be pinpointed.</p> <p>6- The two Tables 1, 2, and Figure 1 must be indicated in the text of the results.</p> <p>7- The two references Adsure <i>et al</i> (2015) and Chitrlekha <i>et al</i> (2018) which have been mentioned in the text, must be changed to Adsure and Mohite (2015) and Chitrlekha <i>and Verma</i> (2018), respectively.</p> <p>8- The three references, barwa and Kumar (2022), Yerrabala <i>et al</i> (2021) and Singg <i>et al</i> (2015) which have been mentioned in the text, have not mentioned in the references list.</p> <p>9- In the reference number eight which has been mentioned in the references list., the author, G. C. Vikram must be corrected to Vikram, G. C.</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: | Mukhtar Abdel Aziz Mohamed Osman |
| Department, University & Country | University of Dongola, Sudan |