

## **Instruction for reviewing of manuscripts submitted to the “Plant Protection News” journal**

Dear reviewer,

We are kindly asking of you to evaluate the manuscript by using a series of criteria found in the table (alongside with notes, where appropriate), making a conclusion and providing a commentary. In the table one answer should be left, either “YES” or “NO” (delete the opposite).

Your recommendation should be one of the variants available (delete the others):

**Accept «as is»** with further technical correction done by the editors.

**Accept with minor revisions** according to the reviewer’s comments (**further reviewing not necessary**, consistency of author’s corrections can be checked by the editors).

**Major revision** according to the reviewer’s comments (**further reviewing is necessary**)

**Reject** (substantiation is necessary)

If you decide that the manuscript needs major revision or deserves rejection, the editorial office is asking to provide clear and detailed comments for improvement/substantiation for rejection. When further reviewing is necessary, the manuscript will be forwarded to you after corrections made by authors alongside with a cover letter indicating all corrections done (answers to comments) as suggested by all the reviewers.

At the bottom of review form, please state the date, your name, scientific degrees, position and affiliation. You are free to provide your confidential commentary to the Editor as well. This information will not be disclosed to the authors as we support “double blind” review process.

Thanks for your kind cooperation,

Editorial office of the «Plant Protection News» journal.

[vestnik@vizr.spb.ru](mailto:vestnik@vizr.spb.ru), [ytokarev@vizr.spb.ru](mailto:ytokarev@vizr.spb.ru)

Review of the manuscript per. № \_\_\_\_\_

« \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_»

submitted to the journal «Plant Protection News»

№	Criterion	Reply*	Notes
<b>I</b>	<b>Quality of the research</b>		
1	The problem is actual and corresponds to the Journal's scope	YES/NO	
2	The material is of scientific novelty	YES/NO	
3	Modern methods and approaches are used corresponding to the research goals	YES/NO	
4	The conclusions cast no doubts	YES/NO	
<b>II</b>	<b>Quality of presentation</b>		
5	Title corresponds to the content, chosen goal is convincing	YES/NO	
6	Abstract reflects the article content	YES/NO	
7	Methods are detailed and clear	YES/NO	
8	Results are correct, Discussion is adequate	YES/NO	
<b>III</b>	<b>Illustative material and bibliography</b>		
9	Tables and Figures are informative and correspond to the content (if present)	YES/NO	
10	Titles, legends and indications are adequate (if present)	YES/NO	
11	The body of modern references of global scale is sufficient **	YES/NO	
12	References in the text correspond to the Reference list	YES/NO	
<b>IV</b>	<b>Manuscript organization</b> (see guides for authors at <a href="https://www.plantprotect.ru/index.php/vizr/about/submissions">https://www.plantprotect.ru/index.php/vizr/about/submissions</a> ) <i>not applicable for submissions in free format</i>		
13	Manuscript size and structure match the article type	YES/NO	
14	Text is devoid of gross stylistic and grammatical errors	YES/NO	
15	Reference style is respected	YES/NO	

\*delete the unnecessary (either YES or NO). Upon doubt, leave the “Response” cell unchanged, add comment

\*\*if tables/figures are absent, leave the “Response” cell unchanged

**REVIEWER'S CONCLUSION** (delete the unnecessary):

**Accept «as is»**

**Accept with minor revisions** (further reviewing not necessary)

**Major revision** (further reviewing is necessary)

**Reject**

**REVIEWER'S COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHORS:**

---

\*\*\*\*\* *not to be sent to authors* \*\*\*\*\*

**REVIEWER'S COMMENTS FOR THE EDITOR:**

Date

Reviewer's name

Scientific degree

Position

Affiliation