

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	

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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	The title is well-chosen, and this type of research is highly relevant and necessary for the scientific community. Studies like this contribute to advancing knowledge, addressing existing gaps, and providing valuable insights that can support further research and practical applications. If properly structured with a thorough review of previous studies, a well-defined methodology, and accurate data analysis, this work	

part.	has the potential to make a meaningful impact in the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 author should review and correct grammatical errors and ensure the manuscript adheres to the scientific review guidelines for the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	In my perspective, No.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Few reference have been added in introduction but no similarity with reference sections.	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. The grammatical check should be done.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The title is appropriate; however, the researcher has not conducted a comprehensive review of previous studies, which weakens the foundation of the research. Additionally, the study lacks a well-structured experimental design, a clear and precise methodology, and reliable results. The data analysis appears insufficient to support the conclusions drawn. Given these significant shortcomings, I believe the article is not suitable for acceptance in its current form and requires substantial revisions."</p> <p>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</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:	Nayan Chandra Howlader
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh Agricultural University, Bangladesh