

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_125170
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Efficacy of Insecticide on the management of onion thrips (<i>Thrips tabaci</i> , Lindemann) in Northwestern zone of Tigray
Type of the Article	Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript presents valuable research on the management of onion thrips (<i>Thrips tabaci</i>), a significant pest affecting onion production in Ethiopia and globally.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Is generally suitable but could be improved for clarity and specificity.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is not fully comprehensive. While it provides an overview of the study, including its purpose, some methods, and select results, it lacks a clear structure and omits important details. The abstract is overly long and includes unnecessary background information, while failing to clearly present the main findings on insecticide efficacy. It also lacks a concise conclusion. To improve, the abstract should be restructured to more concisely and clearly present the study's objectives, methods, key results, and conclusions.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The abstract is not well-structured and contains too much detail Some sections (e.g., Materials and Methods) lack sufficient detail</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Based on my review, here are some errors and areas for improvement in the manuscript:</p> <p>Formatting and consistency issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inconsistent use of bold and italics for headings and scientific names - Inconsistent spacing between sections - Inconsistent capitalization in headings and titles <p>Citation issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inconsistent citation format (some in-text citations use et al., others list all authors) - Some references mentioned in the text are missing from the reference list (e.g., Brian, 2006) <p>Data presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figures 3 and 4 are low quality and lack proper labeling - Tables 2 and 3 have formatting issues and lack clear explanations of abbreviations <p>Scientific content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of statistical analysis for the yield data - Insufficient discussion of the results in relation to previous studies <p>Typographical errors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Several misspellings (e.g., "Iselemti" instead of "Tselemti" in Table 2 title) - Inconsistent use of decimal points and commas for numbers <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The conclusion section repeats information from the results without providing deeper insights <p>Units:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inconsistent use of units (e.g., switching between t/ha and kg/ha) 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some references are incomplete or incorrectly formatted - Inconsistent use of journal abbreviations 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Grammar and language errors: Several sentences with awkward phrasing or grammatical mistakes Use of informal language in some parts (e.g., "Still now the problem of this particular insect pest is existing.")</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>These issues should be addressed to improve the overall quality and clarity of the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Arnaldo Esquivel Fariña
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional de Asunción, Paraguay