

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International.
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_129960
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Drone-Assisted Thiamethoxam 12.6% + Lambda-Cyhalothrin 9.5% ZC Against Pink Bollworm (<i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i>) in Cotton
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important as it highlights the effectiveness of drone-based insecticide application for sustainable pest management in cotton farming. The findings provide valuable insights into modern, precise, and efficient agricultural practices, addressing key challenges in large-scale pest control.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and conveys the primary focus of the study. However, it could be made more concise and engaging while retaining its technical accuracy. Here is a suggested alternative: "Drone-Assisted Application of Thiamethoxam 12.6% + Lambda-Cyhalothrin 9.5% ZC for Managing Pink Bollworm in Cotton"	
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 abstract is comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the study, including the objectives, methodology, results, and significance. However, some improvements could enhance clarity and impact: Avoid Repetition: Details about the knapsack sprayer application being at par could be streamlined to avoid redundancy. Highlight Practical Implications: The abstract could briefly emphasize the broader implications of drone technology for sustainable agriculture and scalability in pest management.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, with a clear experimental design and quantitative results supporting its findings. The use of measurable data and the focus on phytotoxicity evaluation strengthen the study's scientific validity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It is advisable to ensure that the majority of references are recent (from the past 5 years) to reflect the latest advancements in drone technology, pesticide formulations, and integrated pest management. If available, including studies or reviews published in 2023 or 2024 could further enhance the manuscript's relevance and demonstrate engagement with the most current scientific literature.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is understandable, slight improvements in sentence structure and grammar would enhance its suitability for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript could benefit from a stronger introduction, providing more background on pink bollworm management and the role of drone technology in agriculture. Expanding the discussion on the broader implications and including visual representations of key results would enhance the clarity and impact of the study.	

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:	Jonnala Subba Reddy
Department, University & Country	Lakireddy Bali Reddy College of Engineering, India