

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Scientific Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JSRR_122152 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Adoption of “Integrated Management of Pink bollworm in Bt cotton” –A Success story |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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>The article is interesting. However, he could be written much better. It seems like just a story, without too many technical details... the origin of the pheromones, the concentrations used. In the only table in the article, the data is very simplistic, and on the last column, only some values are simply presented, without possibly stating the standard deviations or standard errors. Indian terms and units of measurement are also used, some of which are not found in international standards.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>I would replace the term "Adoption" with "Implementation"</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 fine.</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>Not. All articles generally have a well-defined structure. Title Abstract Key words Introduction Material and method Results and discussion Conclusions Bibliographic references that's why I was saying that this article is more like a story and not a scientific paper</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>As I wrote before, the idea, the topic of the article is a good one. The way the results are presented is wrong. I would recommend that the author(s) revise the manuscript.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>I have no other suggestions for bibliographic references. However, they are not very current, some are over 20 years old. This leads me to believe that the presented method for combating cotton pests is not exactly new.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>I recommend that authors work with a certified translator or a native English speaker.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The article is a good one, but it needs a little revision.</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: | Daniel Cocan |
| Department, University & Country | University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine, Romania |