

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4596
Title of the Manuscript:	Harnessing Hormesis: Exploring Insecticide Dose-Response Dynamics for Sustainable Pest Management
Type of the Article	Review

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	A better comprehension of hormesis, including how it affects insect behavior, the emergence of resistance, and physiological reactions, helps develop more sustainable and efficient pest management strategies. With this knowledge, techniques that lessen the environmental impact of pest management procedures while simultaneously increasing the efficiency of pest population reduction can be designed. It is essential to carefully evaluate dosage levels and environmental factors to develop customized strategies that optimize efficacy while reducing adverse effects.	Thank you for your valuable feedback. I have incorporated the suggested changes to improve clarity, conciseness, and specificity. I appreciate your insights, which have helped enhance the overall quality of the discussion.
Is the title of the article	Yes, The article title is suitable	Thank you.

suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is enough. There is a slight correction in the first part of the abstract which is mentioned in the manuscript file.	Thank you for your feedback. I have rectified the error. Kindly check the revised manuscript and the reply to your review comments for better understanding.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	Thank you.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient	Thank you.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	Thank you so much.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Minor correction is required PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT There is no ethical issue in this manuscript. There is no competing interest issue.	I have made the corrections.

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)	NA.

