

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_118617
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of botanicals against the 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>)

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>Yes</p> <p>Changed</p> <p>Changed</p> <p>Too many. Changed.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Latest references could be added.</p> <p>While the work is good, the manuscript is poorly written. Careless pasting of paragraphs could be observed. Too many errors of writing distracted the reader from concentrating on the content.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The materials and methods lack clarity. Unnecessary elaboration about crop husbandry is provided but enough details of the experiment regarding treatment imposition and data recorded are not provided (botanicals: preparation, application method, frequency of application; duration of observations, methods of observation and pooling of data).</p> <p>Without correcting these fatal errors, the MS may not be accepted for publication.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N. Geetha
Department, University & Country	Fiji