



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3493
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Bio-Efficacy of Compatible Agrochemicals against Sucking Pests in Soybean
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	The manuscript “Evaluation of Bio-Efficacy of Compatible Agrochemicals against Sucking Pests in Soybean” is relevant for researchers and the scientific community.	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review our original article. We sincerely appreciate your insightful feedback and constructive comments. We have carefully considered each of your suggestions and have made the necessary corrections as outlined in the manuscript.</p> <p>Your thorough review has undoubtedly strengthened the quality and clarity of our work and we are grateful for your valuable input. We believe that these revisions have significantly improved the overall coherence and effectiveness of our manuscript.</p>
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title of the manuscript is suitable	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract is comprehensive	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Very appropriate	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	The manuscript is very relevant with current research and it is scientifically correct	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have	The references are a combination of recent and old researches	



<p>suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors should consider minor revision. Since they are using numbering system in citation in the body of the manuscript, I don't think it is appropriate combining the names of the authors cited and numbers at the same time. Kindly consider the corrections as written in red and italics.	Made necessary corrections as mentioned.
<u>Optional</u> comments	This manuscript is acceptable and suitable for publication. I suggest that authors should review for corrections. The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound for publication after review.	Thank You

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	Not applicable