

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_81780
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of weather factors on Succession and incidence of insect pests in soybean
Type of the Article	

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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>Major revision</p>	<p>Manuscript should revised substantially, writing pattern not according to the scientific language, Article can be accepted after suggested modifications</p> <p>Comments for authors</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>Introduction of subject experiment not given and explained. Author should explain briefly why this study required to conduct? Results presentations not in scientific terms, it should need to revise profoundly. Future directions are also not presented well overloaded text should need to removed.</p> <p>Keywords. This sections also should need to revisit according scientific requirement</p> <p>1. Introduction/Background</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are several overlapping information in this section, authors are advised to remove such information. 2. Remove all outdated references and keep the latest. 3. Overall need more explanation and background in this section 4. Lot of grammar error in this section, should need to revise again <p>Material and Methods</p> <p>Experimental data and results should be recent years, it should be repeat in recent year</p> <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no significance shown in all tables 2, data was not interpret properly 2. Results are described without heading, make sub-headings and describe information under those sub-headings. 3. Result presentation is very rough, should need to rewrite <p>Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The discussion need to revised and need to make it more focused based on results. 2. Remove the overlapping information/statements. 3. Interpretation was not justifiable 	

Review Form 1.6

	4. Irrelevant and extra data need to be removed	
	References	
	1. Update the reference section with latest findings keep only those old references which are utmost important.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Habib Ali
Department, University & Country	Khwaja Fareed University of Engineering and Information Technology, Pakistan