



Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_UPJOZ_3493</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of Bio-Efficacy of Compatible Agrochemicals against Sucking Pests in Soybean</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</b></p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b></p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b></p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, Is the manuscript important for scientific community.</b></p> <p>2. <b>No</b>, it is not but we can suggest: Evaluation of the Bioefficacy of compatible agrochemicals against whiteflies and thrips in soybeans in Sankeshwar</p> <p>3. the article is not comprehensible, the abstract lacks a description of the protocol, the control is not clearly specified and the species of thrips is not specified. the abstract does not mention phytotoxicity, which of the combinations can control these pests and at which dose? What is the status of the soybean variety used with regard to resistance to these two pests?</p> <p>4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>5. No, the methodology is not detailed enough: was the work carried out in the greenhouse, in the field, in the laboratory? How are the sprays applied? at what dose? the treatment time? the time at which the treatment is carried out? some treatments do not contain any fertiliser and how is the comparison made? The data collection was not clearly mentioned, nor was the software used to analyse the data. The experimental</p>	<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>



<p><b>and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>set-up needs to be reviewed. Read the article entitled 'In vitro optimization of the effectiveness of biopesticides in the control of the main pests of cowpea by using response surface methodology' DOI <a href="https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ijbcs.v15i1.5">https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ijbcs.v15i1.5</a></p> <p>As for the results, the table is not easy to understand. The averages, classes and probabilities need to be clearly expressed for the results to be understood. The conclusion needs to be improved.</p> <p>6. Needs improvement <a href="https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ijbcs.v15i1.5">https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ijbcs.v15i1.5</a></p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p>		
<p><b><u>Optional</u></b> comments</p>	<p>The methodology used must be clearly explained, elements can be added to the theme, the abstract must be more detailed. The system should provide more information on the work carried out.</p> <p>The software used was not mentioned.</p> <p>the results are not well presented.</p> <p>the conclusion is also ephemeral.</p>	<p>Corrected</p>



**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