

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJPSS_117701
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative efficacy and economics of selected chemicals with neem oil against mustard aphid, Lipaphis erysimi (Kaltenbench)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This topic is very important to the scientific community in fact it is imperative that established ratios, concentrations and economic evaluations be conducted to optimise pesticide quality especially with the present climate changes.</p> <p>The title is very suitable and in alignment with the design.</p> <p>The abstract is 209 words, and could have included at least one sentence to explain the statistical analysis used across the treatment groups in the RBD.</p> <p>Some of the methodology was introduced in the results and the results section contained discussion instead of explaining the significance of the findings. A discussion section could have been included.</p> <p>It is a scientifically good paper. The references are across 16 years and only 2 in the last 2-years. More recent publications could have helped to justify these findings and support the economics.</p> <p>When preparing a manuscript is quite normal to have a few grammatical errors, it is however important to have the document proofread to ensure the correct grammar, punctuation and tense is presented.</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>Focus on the past tense when writing about a study that was completed.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Well written overall. The use of simple statistical analysis can validate this study, its relevance and impact.</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>Arlene Williams-Persad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago</b>