

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121333
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of newer insecticide molecules against leaf hopper, <i>Amritodes atkinsoni</i> Leth. infesting mango ecosystem
Type of the Article	Original review 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 is significant for the scientific community as it evaluates the efficacy of newer insecticide molecules against a major pest in mango cultivation, <i>Amritodes atkinsoni</i>, which is crucial for enhancing fruit yield and quality. The study provides valuable data on the effectiveness of various insecticides, particularly highlighting the superiority of Thiomethoxam and Imidacloprid. I appreciate the practical relevance of this research for improving pest management strategies in mango ecosystems, though the manuscript could benefit from clearer presentation of results and more in-depth statistical analysis.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Evaluation of newer insecticide molecules against leaf hopper, <i>Amritodes atkinsoni</i> Leth. infesting mango ecosystem," is somewhat clear but could be more precise. A more suitable title could be:</p> <p>"Evaluation of Novel Insecticides for Controlling <i>Amritodes atkinsoni</i> Leaf Hopper in Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) Cultivation"</p> <p>This title emphasizes the focus on novel insecticides and the specific context of mango cultivation.</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 fairly comprehensive but could be more concise and clearer. I suggest the following improvements:</p> <p>Clarify Results: Mention the specific reduction percentages in hopper population for the most effective treatments.</p> <p>Remove Redundancies: Omit repetitive phrases like "against mango leaf hopper" and unnecessary details (e.g., specific concentrations) that can be detailed in the main text.</p> <p>Include Yield Data: Briefly mention the impact on mango yield and the cost-benefit analysis, as these are critical findings.</p> <p>These changes would enhance the abstract's focus and readability.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, but a few improvements could be made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction: The introduction is well-structured, providing a clear background and rationale for the study. However, it could benefit from a more focused statement of objectives at the end. Materials and Methods: This section is detailed, but it would be more organized if it were divided into distinct subsections (e.g., "Study Area," "Experimental Design," "Insecticide Application," "Data Collection") to enhance readability. Results and Discussion: Combining these sections is common, but separating them into "Results" and "Discussion" would allow for a clearer presentation and interpretation of findings. This separation can help readers distinguish between the data and the authors' interpretation. Conclusion: The conclusion is appropriate but could be expanded to briefly summarize the practical implications of the findings for mango cultivation. <p>Overall, the structure is solid but could benefit from these adjustments to improve clarity and flow.</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>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound as it follows a systematic approach to evaluating the efficacy of different insecticides against <i>Amritodes atkinsoni</i> in mango cultivation. The experimental design, including the use of Randomized Block Design and appropriate controls, strengthens the validity of the findings. The statistical analysis, though briefly mentioned, supports the reliability of the results, and the inclusion of cost-benefit analysis adds practical value. However, a more detailed explanation of the statistical</p>	

Review Form 3

	methods used would further enhance the scientific rigor of the study.	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are relevant but appear somewhat limited and could benefit from more recent studies to enhance the manuscript's currency. Most of the references are from studies published before 2021, with only one from that year. Including more recent references (2022 onwards) would strengthen the manuscript by providing up-to-date context and supporting the findings with the latest research.</p> <p>Suggestions for additional references:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recent studies on the efficacy of insecticides in mango cultivation. 2. Updated reviews on the management of leaf hoppers in fruit crops. 3. Any meta-analyses or large-scale studies comparing different insecticides for pest management. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication but could be improved in several areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity and Precision: Some sentences are lengthy and complex, which could affect clarity. Simplifying and breaking them into shorter, clearer statements would improve readability. 2. Consistency: Ensure consistent use of terminology and avoid repetitive phrases. For example, the term "mango leaf hopper" is repeated frequently and could be replaced with pronouns or shortened in some instances. 3. Grammar and Style: There are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that need correction. For instance, "molecules" should be "molecules," and some sentences need restructuring for better flow. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into the efficacy of newer insecticides against <i>Amritodes atkinsoni</i> in mango cultivation. It is well-organized and presents relevant findings. However, improving clarity in the language, updating references, and separating the Results and Discussion sections would enhance the manuscript's quality and impact.</p>	

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)
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thirunahari Ugandhar
Department, University & Country	Kakatiya Govt College, Kakatiya University, India