

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_122874
Title of the Manuscript:	The Possible Potential of Pheromone Traps Against Invasive Pest <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> .
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 topic of the study is definitely current and worthy of research. FAW is getting to be a global problem. Moving away from synthetic pesticides or even reducing the amount of pesticides in agriculture is getting more important by the day.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. I suggest: The Potential use of Pheromone Traps in managing the Invasive Pest <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>. In this way, the results are still very positive, since monitoring of the pest can lead to reducing the amount of pesticides used.	
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, but please stick to the required format.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The numbering of sections seemed odd, since some were numbered (Statistical analyses) but some were not (Results). And why are the observations not part of the results?	
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.	Apart from the odd pasted sections already mentioned, the written results and the tabled results were not always the same. See my comments in the manuscript. I also don't understand the control. No traps, but it means nothing was monitored? Surely, if the effect of traps on the FAW population was tested, the FAW should have been monitored in another way (damage to plants perhaps?)	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but the reference style is wrong.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No .Please see my suggestions.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The topic is relevant, but the manuscript needs more attention.	

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:	Anelia Marais
Department, University & Country	South Africa