

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_123293
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficiency and residues of spinosad, methoxyfenzide and diflubenzuron against <i>Spodoptera littoralis</i> (Boisd.) on tomato fruits under field conditions
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>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the effectiveness and residual effects of three insecticides (spinosad, methoxyfenzide, and diflubenzuron) against <i>Spodoptera littoralis</i>, a major agricultural pest. The study's comprehensive approach, combining field trials, laboratory experiments, and residue analysis, offers a holistic view of pest control strategies that is highly relevant to the scientific community. The findings on insecticide efficacy and dissipation rates in tomato fruits are particularly important for developing safer and more effective pest management practices.</p>	<p>The study's comprehensive approach, combining field trials, laboratory experiments, and residue analysis, offers a holistic view of pest control strategies that is highly relevant to the scientific community. The findings on insecticide efficacy and dissipation rates in tomato fruits are particularly important for developing safer and more effective pest management practices</p>
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>This title is generally suitable as it accurately reflects the main focus of the study. It mentions the specific insecticides tested, the target pest species, the crop, and the field conditions. However, to make it slightly more concise and impactful, I might suggest a small modification:</p> <p>"Efficacy and Residual Analysis of Three Insecticides Against <i>Spodoptera littoralis</i> on Field-Grown Tomatoes"</p>	<p>"Efficacy and Residual Analysis of Three Insecticides Against <i>Spodoptera littoralis</i> (Boisd.) on Field-Grown Tomatoes"</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 generally comprehensive, covering the main aspects of the study. However, there are a few areas where it could be improved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity: The opening sentence could be more specific about the study's location and importance of <i>S. littoralis</i>. Methods: Add a brief mention of the analytical method used for residue analysis (QuEChERS and HPLC-DAD). Results: Include more specific data on residue levels and dissipation rates. Conclusion: Strengthen by explicitly stating the implications for pest management and food safety. Consistency: Ensure consistent spelling of "<i>Spodoptera littoralis</i>" throughout. <p>Suggested additions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief mention of analytical methods Specific residue levels and dissipation rates Clearer implications for pest management and food safety 	<p>Yes, the abstract of the article comprehensive.</p>
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate and follows a standard scientific format. However, there are a few areas that could be improved:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The main sections (Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, Conclusion) are present and in logical order. Subsections within Materials and Methods are well-organized. <p>Areas for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Results and Discussion are combined. Consider separating these into two distinct sections for clarity. The Introduction could benefit from clearer subsections to organize the background information. 	<p>Yes, subsections and structure are of the manuscript appropriate</p>

Review Form 3

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Add a separate "Objectives" or "Aims" subsection at the end of the Introduction. 4. Consider adding a "Statistical Analysis" subsection in Materials and Methods. 5. The Conclusion section could be expanded and more clearly delineated from the Results and Discussion. 6. Add an "Acknowledgments" section if appropriate. 7. Ensure all tables and figures are properly numbered and referenced in the text. <p>Overall, the structure is suitable, but these small adjustments could enhance the manuscript's organization and readability.</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>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness in several key aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study employs a well-designed experimental approach, utilizing both laboratory and field trials to evaluate the efficacy of three insecticides against <i>Spodoptera littoralis</i> on tomatoes. This comprehensive approach strengthens the validity of the results. 2. The researchers use established analytical methods, including QuEChERS extraction and HPLC-DAD analysis, for pesticide residue determination. These are widely accepted techniques in the field, lending credibility to the residue analysis data. 3. The study considers both initial and residual effects of the insecticides, as well as their dissipation rates over time. This thorough examination provides valuable insights into the persistence and effectiveness of the treatments, which is crucial for practical pest management applications. 4. The inclusion of pre-harvest intervals (PHI) and comparison with established Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) demonstrates a commitment to food safety considerations, enhancing the practical relevance of the research. <p>These elements collectively contribute to a scientifically robust and technically sound manuscript that offers valuable insights for both pest management practices and food safety concerns in tomato cultivation.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be generally relevant and cover key aspects of the research topic.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent.</p>

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The overall language and English quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there is room for improvement. Here's a balanced assessment:</p> <p>Areas for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be polished. 2. Some sentences are overly long and complex, which can hinder clarity. 3. Consistency in spelling and formatting (e.g., "Spodoptera littoralis" should always be italicized) needs attention. 4. There are a few instances of informal language that could be made more academic. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A thorough proofreading by a native English speaker or professional editing service would significantly enhance the manuscript's language quality. 2. Breaking down some longer sentences into shorter, more concise statements would improve readability. 3. Ensuring consistent use of tenses throughout the paper would strengthen its coherence. 	<p>The language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scientific merit: The study appears to be well-designed and addresses an important topic in agricultural pest management and food safety. 2. Methodology: The experimental approach is sound, using both laboratory and field trials, and employing established analytical methods. 3. Results and discussion: The findings seem valuable and relevant to the field. 4. Structure: The overall structure is appropriate, though some improvements in organization could be made. 5. Language quality: While generally suitable, there are areas where the English could be improved for clarity and professionalism. 6. References: The bibliography covers relevant topics but could benefit from more recent sources. 7. Ethical considerations: No major ethical issues are apparent, but more explicit statements on ethical compliance would strengthen the manuscript. <p>The manuscript shows promise and contains valuable research, but requires significant improvements in areas such as language polish, updating of references, and clearer organization of some sections. With these revisions, it has the potential to make a meaningful contribution to the field.</p>	

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>	<p>No. ethical issues are not in this manuscript</p>

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Syed Muneeb Haider
Department, University & Country	University of Gujrat, Pakistan