

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_118617
Title of the Manuscript:	Ecofriendly management of Fruit borer (<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>) on Tomato
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.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <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. It does not seem very innovative. From my point of view, an eco-friendly management can not only be based in botanicals, which additionally were applied at the same dose, at the same time, several times... 2. The title is not suitable. Please, re-word. 3. Please, re-write is not comprehensive as it is, is like only a list of results, and not expressed in a clear way 4. Ok 5. Need a review 6. The practical application of products used should be indicated (regulatory point of view) 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Ok Why only one dose (and the same for all treatments) were used? The other treatments done in field, were the same in all plots? Then, why are so described? The statistical results does not seem ok; very few differences are described as significantly different. In results, please first text, then tables. Do no start with a table. Do not repeat values/results, in text or in table. Do not repeat results in conclusion</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:	M Giner
Department, University & Country	Spain