

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_130767
Title of the Manuscript:	Infestation of mulberry leaves by Leaf roller/webber-Diaphania pulverulentalis (Hampson) and Glyphodes pyloalis (walker) and its management strategies
Type of the Article	Research Article

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 part.	This manuscript addresses a critical issue in sericulture: the infestation of mulberry leaves by major pests such as Diaphania pulverulentalis and Glyphodes pyloalis. The work emphasizes the economic significance of controlling these pests to ensure the quality of mulberry leaves and, consequently, silk production. The integration of IPM strategies highlights its importance for sustainable pest management and offers valuable insights for researchers and practitioners in the field of sericulture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The present title does an outstanding job of describing the research content. However, consider simplifying it for readability: "Management of Mulberry Leaf Roller Infestation by Diaphania pulverulentalis and Glyphodes pyloalis."	
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 includes complete information that perfectly summarizes all key sections of the paper. This section contains meaningful information about background context alongside what makes the research necessary along with its research aims and measurable results. Implementation success would benefit from quantitative evidence such as IPM's ability to minimize pest infestation frequencies. Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Quantitative data should demonstrate the specific effects which IPM strategies produce. ➤ The abstract introduces background content only to expand on significant research results. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The paper contains accurate scientific information which stems from extensive research. This manuscript reviews existing scholarly work effectively by seamlessly integrating results and findings of different studies to validate its main points. The recommended IPM strategies derive from established trustworthy evidence.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	A solid list of relevant references contains recent and foundational research works. The manuscript could benefit from additional studies conducted during 2022 up to 2024 in order to remain current. Suggested Additions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Researchers should incorporate investigations about upcoming pest control systems. ➤ The author needs to format references in alignment with the journal guidebook specifications. 	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The academic communication style expresses itself through simple language written for scholarly purposes. A careful review of grammatical mistakes together with normalization of verbalization will enhance document readability. Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Revise sentences for conciseness.➤ Throughout the entire manuscript use a standardized set of terms.	
Optional/General comments	The study provides an in-depth examination of the issue together with practical solution recommendations. Additional diagrams such as lifecycle models and IPM workflow designs would make the material easier to understand and more interesting for readers. Strategy cost benefits should be studied in detail to improve actual implementation. No ethical issues were identified in the manuscript. No evidence of plagiarism was observed. The content appears original and supported by citations.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oli Ahmed
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh Sericulture Research & Training Institute, Bangladesh