

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_115131
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of methyl eugenol and cue lure traps for monitoring of cucurbit fruit fly (<i>Bactrocera</i> spp.) in different doses in pumpkin
Type of the 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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript is important to the scientific community</p> <p>2. The title does not describe the entire content of the article. I suggest an alternative title "Optimizing Pumpkin Protection: Dosage Effects of Methyl Eugenol and Cue Lure on Fruit Fly Attraction Efficiency"</p> <p>3. The abstract is not comprehensive, it should contain at least the background, objectives, methods, results and conclusions. However, in the discussion section, the author did not discuss the research results properly. The author only writes the results without any discussion. It is best to conduct relevant discussions regarding these results</p> <p>4. already appropriate</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The majority of these manuscripts still use references over 10 years. Use the latest references no later than 10 years.</p> <p>7. In the conclusion section, simply explain the conclusions from the results of this research. what is the prospective future of this research. Remove the section that lists the results of previous research, it would be better to add it to the discussion section.</p> <p>8. Pay attention to writing rules, especially when writing plant species names that must be italicized, writing table numbers and others</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the article is of good English quality. However, there are some minor errors that can be corrected to improve clarity and consistency. Some sentences are too long and complicated, Some minor grammatical errors, such as inappropriate use of punctuation or mixed up words, need to be corrected to maintain language consistency. However, overall the article provides clear and well-structured information. With minor revisions, this article will be more professional and easier to understand.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sri Oktavia
Department, University & Country	School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Indonesia