

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122251
Title of the Manuscript:	Synergistic strategies for the management of thrips, <i>Scirtothrips dorsalis</i> in pomegranate ecosystem
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)
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple treatments and replications ensure the reliability and robustness of the results. • A systematic approach to counting thrips population before and after treatment is meticulous. • The results demonstrate that integrating in-situ vermiculture with chemical and botanical treatments is more effective than using vermiculture alone. • The discussion effectively connects findings with previous research. Referencing studies on similar insecticides and their effects on other crops provides a strong scientific basis for conclusions. • Remember to add a period at the end of each sentence. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experimental design <p>This section includes seven treatments and three replications. It does not clearly describe each treatment in detail. It is better to use at least the treatment's name and refer table after this.</p> <p>There is potential inconsistency in the used terminology untreated checks and controls need to be consistent. It's unclear if these refer to the same treatment.</p> <p>Although ANOVA is mentioned, there is no explanation of the specific statistical methods like post-hoc tests applied, or assumptions checked used to analyze the data.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results and Discussion <p>While the data presentation is detailed, the section could benefit from a more concise summary of the overall trends observed across all treatments and sprays.</p> <p>More explicit statements about which differences are statistically significant would strengthen the interpretation of the results.</p> <p>The discussion could delve deeper into the possible mechanisms behind why certain treatments were more effective like why thiamethoxam outperformed other treatments or why the combination of vermiculture and botanicals was less effective could be explored more thoroughly.</p> <p>While the yield data is presented, the section does not fully explain why certain treatments led to higher yields.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		

Review Form 3

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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shreejana K.C
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Nepal