

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_126269
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of biopesticides against sucking pests infesting moth bean [<i>Vigna aconitifolia</i> (Jacq.) Marechal]
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it contributes valuable insights into the alternatives of harmful synthetic insecticides by utilizing the biological control approaches for managing economically important pests. I appreciate the manuscript for its clear and well-designed experiments and its potential impact on benefiting farmers directly via its adaptation for pest management in various agroecosystems. However, I believe that certain sections could benefit from deeper analysis.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In my opinion, the title could be "Efficacy of biopesticides against sucking pests of moth bean [<i>Vigna aconitifolia</i> (Jacq.) Marechal] in Gujarat"	
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.	The abstract is clear but could be reworded so that is easier for reader to understand. The first line of the abstract should include the general introduction about the topic which is missing in the abstract. Then briefly describe the purpose of this study, the methods and methodology and any experimental details that are important to mention. A concluding sentence could be added about the role of this study on integrated pest management practices after the result portion. It would be better to add core information from each subsection as there is enough room to expand.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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.	This manuscript is technically good and scientifically strong. Also, the appropriate statistical methods to analyze the findings has enhance its level to a broader scientific context. Overall, the paper is clear, concise, well-reliable and accurately interpreted. The paper should have also included the limitations of the study acknowledging the potential factors for biasness to make this study more robust.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The author has included very few references in the manuscript. More references are required in the introduction section and the discussion section. I recommend adding recent studies that support the findings of the study.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are some grammatical and typos errors for which thorough proofreading is necessary.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction: Introduction is very short and is missing the major flow of the information necessary to lead to the major aim of conducting this study. The author needs to add more references. The author needs to include one more paragraph introducing biopesticides and rationale of the study. The objective of the study is missing in the introduction,</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More information is required about the site of the study. Please add a map showing the location of the study and include its geocoordinate in the method. 2. Please provide detailed justification for selecting the biopesticides for the study. 3. Please cite the method used for recording the pest population. 4. Explain the application method of biopesticides with more information and steps. <p>More details are required in this sub-section</p> <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The table used in the result section has not been referenced anywhere in the text. Please add it. 2. Clearly label the figures and tables 3. Add more citations and more supporting papers while discussing the findings <p>Conclusion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The conclusion section should provide a summary, but it lacks alignment with subsections of the manuscript 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Bhawana Regmi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Agriculture and Forestry University, Nepal</p>