

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_120796
Title of the Manuscript:	SEASONAL INCIDENCE OF MAJOR INSECT PESTS IN RELATION TO ABIOTIC FACTORS IN MUSTARD
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for 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 guideline for 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript attempts to address the important topic of how abiotic factors influence the seasonal incidence of major insect pests in mustard crops. Understanding these relationships is crucial for developing effective pest management strategies and enhancing crop protection, which can significantly impact agricultural productivity. However, the manuscript suffers from major issues in clarity, methodology, and data presentation, making it difficult to derive reliable conclusions. Despite its potential relevance, the numerous flaws diminish its value to the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Correlation Between Abiotic Factors and Seasonal Incidence of Major Insect Pests in Mustard</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. This paper is a scrap and is not worth publishing.</p> <p>Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear Objective: Explicitly state the aim of the study at the beginning. 2. Study Location and Duration: Clearly mention the place and duration of the study to avoid confusion. 3. Methodology Overview: Provide a concise overview of the methodology, including key details about the experimental design and data collection. 4. Key Findings: Highlight the most important results, including significant correlations and peak pest populations. 5. Implications: Briefly mention the practical implications of the findings for pest management. <p>Deletions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unnecessary Details: Remove redundant information, such as repeated explanations of the study design. 2. Confusing Data: Simplify the presentation of results to make them clearer and more impactful. 3. Grammatical Errors: Correct grammatical mistakes to enhance readability and professionalism. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript need improvement for clarity and coherence. Here are some specific suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The abstract should be concise, well-organized, and include the aim, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. The current abstract is somewhat lengthy and repetitive. 2. Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The introduction should clearly outline the background, the problem statement, and the objectives of the study. Currently, it lacks a clear problem statement and the flow is disjointed. 3. Materials and Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This section should be clearly divided into subsections such as "Study Area," "Experimental Design," "Data Collection," and "Data Analysis." The current format mixes these elements, making it hard to follow. 4. Results and Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The results should be presented in a structured manner, ideally with separate subsections for each pest. The discussion should interpret the results in the context of existing literature, which is currently lacking. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>5. Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The conclusion should succinctly summarize the main findings and their implications. It should not introduce new information or repeat the results section verbatim. <p>Suggested Structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title: Should be precise and reflective of the study's focus. 2. Abstract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Aim ○ Methodology ○ Key findings ○ Conclusion ○ Keywords 3. Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Background ○ Problem statement ○ Objectives 4. Materials and Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Study Area ○ Experimental Design ○ Data Collection ○ Data Analysis 5. Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mustard Aphid ○ Leaf Webber ○ Mustard Sawfly ○ Painted Bugs ○ Flea Beetle ○ Coccinellids 6. Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interpretation of Results ○ Comparison with Previous Studies ○ Implications for Pest Management 7. Conclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Summary of Key Findings ○ Practical Implications ○ Future Research Directions 8. References <p>By following this structure, the manuscript will be more organized, making it easier for readers to understand the study's purpose, methodology, results, and implications.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>		
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>No</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Sarwan Kumar
Department, University & Country	PAU, India