

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_116822
Title of the Manuscript:	“Comparative efficacy of some insecticides and their combination against okra shoot and fruit borer, <i>Earias vitella</i> (Fabricius)”
Type of the Article	Original 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. The results will be valuable in Integrated Pest Management for food security. There was inserted two names of pest in article title. Please refer to the comments on the manuscript. The abstract is comprehensive but needs some improvement. Please refer to the comments on the manuscript. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. No. Introduction, materials and methods need improvement. Please refer to the comments on the manuscript. The manuscript's references are not as per journal instructions. Journal instructions have not been followed for the reference style. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The article's English quality is appropriate for scientific communication. However, proofreading is necessary to ensure that the manuscript uses clear and concise English that enables readers to fully comprehend its content.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdul Ghaffar Khoso
Department, University & Country	Northwest Agriculture and Forestry University, China