

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125156
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bridging tradition and technology: Integrating indigenous knowledge for effective pest management in agriculture</b>
Type of the 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	This study document indigenous technical knowledge (ITK) practices used by farmers for managing pests and diseases in agricultural crops. It focuses on understanding traditional methods and their relevance in sustainable pest and disease control using literature review and case study.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Since the article only focuses on traditional practices on pest control, My suggestion is: Indigenous technical knowledge practices for managing pests and diseases in agricultural crops	
<b>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.</b>	It is ok.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes.	
<b>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.</b>	Overall, this manuscript has been written well. The use of English language is not bad, and the sections follow clearly. In results and discussion: The case studies and literatures for each section (traditional practices) are very short. The manuscript can be scientifically robust by adding some more relevant references.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =	Yes.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Not bad, can be improved.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Saeedeh Javar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Golestan Agricultural and Natural Resources Research and Education Center, Iran</b>