Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAHR_87447**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effects of different pesticides on the biological control agent, Habrobracon hebetor Say (Hymenoptera: Braconidae): A review**
Type of the Article	**review**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJAHR/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	Dear Editor, here are my suggestions: TITLE No suggestions for improvements. ABSTRACT No suggestions for improvements. KEY WORDS Use words that help in the search for the article, but that are not in the title. INTRODUCTION It is recommended to write paragraphs presenting an idea, developing and concluding. Ideally, the paragraph should be at least three sentences long. However, long paragraphs make it difficult to understand. METHOD The word Method is recommended, since the word Methodology means the science that studies the Method. It is recommended to write paragraphs presenting an idea, developing and concluding. Ideally, the paragraph should be at least three sentences long. However, long paragraphs make it difficult to understand. RESULTS It is recommended to write paragraphs presenting an idea, developing and concluding. Ideally, the paragraph should be at least three sentences long. However, long paragraphs make it difficult to understand. I advise you to avoid starting a paragraph with a quote [According to Abedi et al. (2014) there was no significant difference...]. The subject is more important than the author. DISCUSSION Given the results presented, I thought that it can be enriched with percentages of works presented with favorable or unfavorable results. REFERENCES Put in alphabetical order. Check that every citation is in the references and vice versa. For example, I did not find the quotes Moreover, Ahmed and Ahmad (2006); Moreover, Mahdavi et al. (2013) etc… As I consider the review well structured, I recommend accepting the **Review**.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Luiz Cláudio Garcia**
Department, University & Country	**State University of Ponta Grossa, Brazil**