

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118914
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFICACY AND ECONOMICS OF SELECTED CHEMICALS AND BIO-PESTICIDES AGAINST MUSTARD APHID [LIPAPHIS ERYSIMI (KALTENBACH)] IN PRAYAGRAJ (U.P.)
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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> <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>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. This research is important because until now there are still not many pesticides that come from natural ingredients. Meanwhile, chemical pesticides cause many unwanted side effects.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive</p> <p>4. subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. References are sufficient and recent.</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>language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The writing of this journal manuscript is good</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>I Dewa Ayu Ratna Dewanti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Jember, Indonesia</b>