



SDI Review Form 1.6


Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_46773
Title of the Manuscript:	Field Evaluation of Newer Insecticides against Spotted pod borer [Maruca vitrata (Geyer)], on Rice fallow Blackgram in North Coastal Andhra Pradesh
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract did not capture brief introduction, materials and methods as well as recommendation. 2. Data as observed was from only one season, as such recommendation will not be good enough 3. The statistical used in the analysis was not stated as well as the probability level in which the means were separated. 4. No GIS of the site was provided 5. The introduction did not capture data collected on blackgram annual production which justified it being regarded as highly remunerated crop. 6. The sampling was wrong. Collecting data from 10 plants/replication is gross inadequate. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Untreated and control means one. Use one term throughout 	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	