

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_118212
Title of the Manuscript:	Field Efficacy and Economics of Certain Biopesticides and Chemicals Against Gram Pod Borer, <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (Hubner) on Greengram [ <i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilczek]
Type of the Article	Original 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript deals with field work related to <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>, a polyphagous pest of economic importance that damages greengram, therefore it is considered a relevant topic.</p> <p>The title seems appropriate</p> <p>The abstract is understandable and is within the recommended number of words for this section (216 words)</p> <p>The subsections of the manuscript seem adequate and are consistent with the development of the work.</p> <p>The manuscript has an adequate structure, as well as data analysis, therefore it is considered to be scientifically acceptable.</p> <p>The references are relatively recent, for an article around 40 references are recommended, in this work only 21 references are considered.</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>The article is understandable</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Improve the format of the graphics, you can include error bars in them</p>	

### PART 2:

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Fatima Lizeth Gandarilla Pacheco</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Instituto de Biotecnología, Universidad Autonoma de Nuevo León, Mexico</b>