

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_122908
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Supervisory Management Strategies for Pod Fly, <i>Melanagromyza obtusa</i> in Pigeonpea
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

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.	This manuscript depicts the benefit of using chemical insecticides in combination with some plant product. Which reduces the harmful effect of synthetic chemical on environment and non-target organisms. Also it describes about the effect of sowing time on insect infestation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is.	
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, its comprehensive. No need to add anything.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	Here the required quantity of observations was taken and the calculation was made significantly. One thing I have suggested to add in methodology is, the formulae for calculation of pod and seed damage.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not in uniform format. The author needs to make it uniform.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	The overall manuscript is good.	

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:	Saswati Premkumari
Department, University & Country	Mahayogi Gorakhnath University, India