

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_122590
Title of the Manuscript:	Innovation Technology of Botanical Insecticides for Controlling Cochineal Scale (<i>Dactylopius opuntiae</i>) Insect on Cactus (<i>Dactylcompound sopius opuntiae</i>) Plant at Southern Tigray, Ethiopia
Type of the 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)
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.	The study is interesting with reference to an alternative strategy to replace chemical based controlling measures for insect pests for sake of environment protection, and to reduce the hazardous impact of chemical base/ synthetic pesticides on environment and human being through food chain. It's a good effort to test the botanical extract directly on field plants to control insects. However some questions have been asked below regarding scientific and technical correctness of manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of the study is suitable however I suggest author to confirm the botanical name of the cactus plant	
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, abstract is comprehensively written, but there are some suggestions for author. The scientific name <i>D. opuntiae</i> is abbreviation; give the full name for first time. Line 7. <i>at Raya-azobo district</i> . should be replaced with (in <i>Raya-azobo district</i>) like this other grammatical/spelling mistakes should be corrected., for example; <i>leave extract (leaves extract)</i>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	All the subsections are well structured but there are some spelling/ grammatical mistakes e.g. Material and methods; The experimental was conducted (The experiment was conducted), 12.80N and 39.60E (Should be written in proper way), The Salt and Liquid soap were used and purchased from the market (The Salt and Liquid soap were purchased from the market)	
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>There are few suggestions and questions regarding scientific and technical correctness of manuscript.</p> <p>I think the extraction method for plant leaves extraction is very simple and could not effectively extract the compounds of plants, rotary shaker based extraction is mostly used for such type of extraction. You should give the reference you followed for this simple type of extraction method.</p> <p>Authors need to briefly describe in data analysis that how severity scale was calculated, give the formula etc.</p> <p>In result section Table 4 shows mortality, same lettering indicates non-significant difference of mortality between liquid soap (30.89 b), Salt*liquid Soap (36.73b) and Water (20.17b) how could it be justified?</p> <p>I suggest to describe the results with word mortality while describing the mortality results of second spray of water to differentiate it from increasing number of insects in untreated group.</p> <p>In discussions for mortality author described the toxic substance terpenoids but how could terpenoids be extracted in water as a solvent. I suggest to make discussion more logical and scientific. Chemical analysis of your extract could be helpful to describe effectiveness of your extract on physiology or behaviour of insect, as you relate with previous studies in discussion. Furthermore, is there similarity between tree tobacco and your studied plants with reference to their compounds?</p> <p>The study cannot conclude the studied plants as a less toxic to non-target organisms and human without any trial regarding these parameters; however author can describe it in discussion with reference of previous studies, if available on these specific plants with these parameters.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most references are too much old; the unnecessary old references could be replaced with most recent. References style is not consistent. There are few typological mistakes e.g Rodriguez and Roderuez (Rodriguez and Niemeyer 1999 Roderuez et al 2001).	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are few typological/spellings and some grammatical mistakes throughout the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The study is based on good and interesting idea to conduct the experiment under field conditions but the results could be described and presented in better way and by focussing on questions regarding technical and scientific correctness.	

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:	Muhammad Zul Hussnain
Department, University & Country	Government College University, Pakistan