

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_128784
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the effectiveness of several sustainable management options for the fall armyworm <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in maize production in Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it contributes valuable insights into the problems faced by the farmers in African agriculture while utilizing the sustainable management options, which may enhance current understanding and drive future research on solving the problem of fall armyworm. It presents perspectives that could address existing gaps in knowledge. I appreciate the manuscript for its clear articulation of the problem and its potential impact on related studies. However, I believe that certain sections could benefit from deeper analysis.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In my opinion, the title could be "Evaluation of sustainable management options for the fall armyworm <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae)"	
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.	The first sentence of the abstract can be made ethically appropriate by altering "black continent" with "African continent". Also, it should include the general introduction about the fall armyworm which is missing in the abstract. For example, mentioning fall armyworm term and the information that fall armyworm is an insect pest. The methodology in the abstract is too long, which could potentially be written well to make it less overwhelming. Similarly, while discussing the result also, it would be better to mention the treatments itself rather than T1, T2, T3 or T4. A concluding sentence could be added about the role of this study in overcoming the constraints in the adoption of pest management practices. Keywords can be arranged in alphabetical order.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	This manuscript has enough scientific findings, with sufficient details and key statistical analyses which makes it easy to assess the reliability of data.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The author has included very few references in the manuscript. More references are required in the introduction section and the discussion section.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are many grammatical and typos errors for which thorough revision is necessary.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction: Introduction is very broad. It would be better to start by describing briefly about major pests of maize. More focus should be given to fall armyworm and its management strategies widely used and/or can be used. The author needs to add more references about similar studies.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More information is required about the site of the study. Please add a map of the country along location of the study in the map and include its geocoordinate in the method in figure 1. 2. In table 1, make consistency in the targets (for example mention the insect pests with only scientific names rather than common name or order). Please correct spelling of Emamectin benzoate and Azadirachtin in Table 1 3. Please cite the method used if this method was previously used by other researchers. 4. Please include number in the subsections within the methodology for logical flow 5. Push-pull technology subsection information could be incorporated into the introduction portion, and only mention the methodology of its use in this subsection <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The table caption in the result section could be elaborated with the location and year of study. Please add it. <p>Conclusion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The conclusion section should provide a summary, but it lacks alignment with subsections of the manuscript 2. Some statements seem unsupportive by the findings, rather they should be drawn from the data presented 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Bhawana Regmi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Agriculture and Forestry University, Nepal</p>