

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_121098
Title of the Manuscript:	Seasonal Incidence of Spodoptera litura (Fab.) in Groundnut with respect to Leaf Damage
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The importance of this topic lies in identifying the optimal conditions for the growth of this insect and implementing effective measures to combat it, ensuring the safety of plants throughout their life cycle.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title focuses solely on the presentation of the idea, rather than the significance of the study.	
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 text should be short, preferably between 200 to 250 words. It currently lacks sufficient detail in presenting all the significant results and changes in the insect count. Additionally, it needs more detailed information on the results that demonstrate the reduction in leaf area. The percentage of damage is minimal and its impact on production may not be evident, which does not address the core issue of the subject.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The introduction is very brief and lacks essential information, particularly about the insect and plant species used. It should also include details about the study area, climate, and soil type.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is important work, but it needs additional support from a second season to confirm the percentage of damage. The current study indicates damage of less than 14%, which is not considered significant, despite several references showing damage exceeding 75%.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The review needs to be consistently organized and supported by more recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ghemam Amara Djilani
Department, University & Country	University El Oued, Algeria