

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_123325
Title of the Manuscript:	"Effects of Insecticides on Pollinators and Natural Enemies in Watermelon Agroecosystems"
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 paper has implications for understanding the influence of some insecticides on beneficial insects in an agroecosystem, with clear and easy-to-understand language. It was correlated with other studies in the literature and there is practical application of this knowledge, emphasizing the need for integrated pest management practices. I am comfortable with the results and the potential contribution this paper will make to the literature.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable.	
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. However, to be more complete the authors could add a sentence about watermelon culture at the beginning of the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are appropriate.	
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.	The article has technical and easy-to-understand language, where the results achieved the proposed objectives. The introduction could better explain the watermelon culture and its importance. The methodology seems adequate, but the results can be better discussed, using more recent references. The authors' task in discussing results is to compare/contrast how their findings align with or refute the previous work of others. Tables must be formatted appropriately, removing unnecessary lines. Captions must be added to the tables, with explanations regarding the statistical differences in the results. The conclusion must be improved and is usually made up of three parts: what you found and what it means; what comes next; and limitations.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Although the paper demonstrates a literature that supports the authors' research, the addition of a few more recent references qualifies the article. The formatting of references should be reviewed by the authors.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is appropriate. However, I suggest that the revised manuscript be reviewed by a professional editor before being resubmitted.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Fernanda Leal Leães
Department, University & Country	Universidade Estadual do Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil