



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
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient</p>	<p>The manuscript “Evaluation of Bio-Efficacy of Compatible Agrochemicals against Sucking Pests in Soybean” is relevant for researchers and the scientific community.</p> <p>Yes the title of the manuscript is suitable</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>Very appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript is very relevant with current research and it is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references are a combination of recent and old researches</p>	



<p>and recent? If you have 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>		
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>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.</p>	
<p><u>Optional</u> comments</p>	<p>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.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph Ekenwosu
Department, University & Country	Imo State University, Nigeria