

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>

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)
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.	Among the different biopesticides tested against sucking pests of moth bean, <i>Beauveria bassiana</i> , neem oil 0.5% and NSKE 5% was found most effective against jassid, <i>Empoasca motti</i> (Pruthi.) and whitefly, <i>Bemisia tabaci</i> (Genn.) whereas neem oil 0.5% and azadirachtin 0.15 EC was found most effective against thrips, <i>Caliothrips indicus</i> (Bagnall).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes 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.	I thoroughly read, all scientific terms were correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Better to add some more references.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saritha Pendlikatla
Department, University & Country	SGS Arts College, India