

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_88207 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Efficacy of Selected insecticides, Beaveriabassina ,Neem oil againstDiamond back moth (Plutella xylostella)(L.) in Cabbage(Brassica oleracea var capitata). |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>)

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | <p>This article described the efficacy of selected insecticide, beaveriabassina, neem oil against <i>Plutellaxylostella</i>inCabbage, which can provide certain guidance and help for prevention and control in agricultural production. However, some issues should be concerned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The abstract needs to be modified and simplified, and highlight the conclusion of this study.- The introduction part should be revised, and most of the reference are too old and need to be updated.- There are many grammatical and writing mistakes in the manuscript, which should be carefully checked and revised.- The calculation formula for Larvalpopulation should be reedited.- Standard error in table and figures is missing.- In overall, Results and Discussion were poorly written. Write-up is more towards reporting the data in sentences form. Please improve this section by analyze/commenting your data as compared to previous similar studies and highlight the reason behind the logic of getting those results. | <p>Thank you sir /Madam for your valuable comments.</p> <p>Abstract is simplified.</p> <p>Introduction updated with new reference and new sentence in own statements.</p> <p>I solve out all the mistakes.</p> <p>Formula is replaced with percent reduction.</p> <p>Standard error are added.</p> <p>Results and discussion is added with more references and elaborated with my own statements.</p> |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> 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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | No |