

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_116235
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOASSAY OF Azadirachta indica AND Jatropha curcas OILS ON Aphis craccivora
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The concept of the manuscript is important for scientific community. However, the manuscript required major improvement before to accept it for publication.</p> <p><b>No, the title is not suitable.</b> Alternative title: EVALUATION OF ANTIFEEDANT/ANTIREPEELENANT ACTIVITY OF OILS OBTAINED FROM THE SEEDS OF AZADIRACHTA INDICA AND JATROPHA CURCAS ON THE PEST- APHIS CRACCIVORA FOUND IN COWPEA</p> <p>The abstract is not acceptable and it needs revision</p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p>No, major revision is required</p> <p>The references are sufficient. However, some of them are not necessary for this study. Especially, those references that discuss anti-tumour/cytotoxic activity.</p> <p>1. The introduction part is very lengthy. It should be shorted to one or two pages. 2. Experimental details are lacking 3. Results and Discussion part is very short. 4. The conclusion part is just line message. This is not acceptable for journals.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>English language is very poor. Necessary corrections are cited in the reviewed text.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>As stated previously that the concept of this manuscript is good. However, the present study did not provide adequate details to accept the manuscript for publication.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Manoharan Karuppiah Pillai</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Eswatini, Eswatini</b>