

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_118251</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Field Efficacy and Economics of Selected Biopesticides and Chemicals against Shoot and Fruit Borer, <i>Earias vittella</i> (Fabricius) on Okra</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original article</b>

### 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> )

### 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The study deals with a field experiment for the control of a pest of economic importance, therefore it is considered a relevant research topic.</p> <p>the title seems appropriate.</p> <p>The abstract seems appropriate and has 245 words which is within the range for this section.</p> <p>The subsections of the manuscript seem adequate and are consistent with the development of the work.</p> <p>The references are relatively recent, for an article around 40 references are recommended, in this work only 22 references are considered.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The article is understandable</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Standardize the font in the manuscript Improve the format of the graphics, you can include error bars in them</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>Fatima Lizeth Gandarilla Pacheco</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Autonoma de Nuevo León, Mexico</b>