

Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4616
Title of the Manuscript:	Alternative Pest Control Method for <i>Myzus persicae</i> (Sulzer) with the Application of Mineral Oils
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.**

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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b> <b>Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> ( <i>Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here</i> )
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript reports evaluation of mineral oils against <i>Myzus persicae</i> . However, it fails to fully justify the present investigation. On one hand, the author(s) report that mineral oils are frequently used against sucking pests on potatoes; at the same time mention that little is known about their potential to manage insect pests on this crop.	

<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	It may be modified as suggested in the reviewed manuscript.	
<b>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.</b>	No, it is not at all comprehensive. It has been edited to some extent in the reviewed manuscript. However, it should be made more comprehensive based on results.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Yes	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	I could not find any reference in the manuscript. They are altogether missing.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No, not at all. It is very poorly written.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b>	<b>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</b>	

## **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

## **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sanjay Kumar Sharma</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, India</b>