

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Applied Life Sciences International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JALSI_83583 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Influence of biopesticides and natural preparations on the regulation of diseases and pests in the ecological protection of tomatoes (<i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i> L.) and cucumbers (<i>Cucumis sativus</i> L.) |
| 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.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/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 | <div>1. In the ABSTRACT part, the expression of the results is too general, and not very clear, and the abstract should be in one paragraph.</div> <div>2. In the INTRODUCTION part, what's the organic protection system? and there were other similar studies? The meaning of your work also need be clear.</div> <div>3. In the MATERIALS AND METHODS part, the conventional pesticides, biopesticides and natural preparations should be detailed, including Ingredients and manufacturers. A season repeat should be added. How get the crop disease, inoculation of pathogenic bacteria or natural disease? Which disease? These question needed been described detailly.</div> <div>4. In the RESULTS AND DISCUSSION part, there are so many treatments, and make reader confused. Table 2 and table 3 can be integrate into one table. What's the difference between K-I and K-II? the discussion is insufficient and mostly is the description of data. Add the convictive discussion is necessary.</div> <div>5. Statistical analysis is missing in all the tables and figs in this manuscript.</div> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <div>6. There are many format mistakes, like “variety of cucumber „Dugi zeleni (eng. Long green)”, and need check total the article one by one.</div> | |
| 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? | <div>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</div> | |

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Huasen Wang |
| Department, University & Country | South University of Science and Technology of China, China |