

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_88207
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Selected insecticides, <i>Beaveria bassina</i> , Neem oil against Diamond back moth ( <i>Plutella xylostella</i> )(L.) in Cabbage( <i>Brassica oleracea</i> var <i>capitata</i> ).
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	This article described the efficacy of selected insecticide, <i>beaveria bassina</i> , neem oil against <i>Plutella xylostella</i> in Cabbage, which can provide certain guidance and help for prevention and control in agricultural production. However, some issues should be concerned: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The abstract needs to be modified and simplified, and highlight the conclusion of this study.</li><li>- The introduction part should be revised, and most of the reference are too old and need to be updated.</li><li>- There are many grammatical and writing mistakes in the manuscript, which should be carefully checked and revised.</li><li>- The calculation formula for Larval population should be reedited.</li><li>- Standard error in table and figures is missing.</li><li>- 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.</li></ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shaoyong Ke
Department, University & Country	Hubei Academy of Agricultural Sciences, China