

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121227
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of various insecticides against gram pod borer (<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (HUBNER)) in chickpea
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**Jack 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>

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
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript assesses the efficacy of distinct insecticides against the gram pod borer (<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>) in chickpea, emphasizing that Spinosad and Emamectin benzoate are the most effective in reducing larval populations and enhancing yield. Also included in the investigation is a cost-benefit analysis that underscores the economic advantages of these treatments. In order to promote agricultural sustainability and food security, these discoveries are essential for enhancing insect management</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The existing title, "Efficacy of various insecticides against gram pod borer (<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (HUBNER)) in chickpea," is appropriate as it effectively communicates the specific objective of the research. Nevertheless, a succinct and captivating option may be:</p> <p>"A Comparative Study on Effective Insecticides for Managing Gram Pod Borer in Chickpea"</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The article's abstract is highly extensive, encompassing the primary aims, methodologies, significant findings, and conclusions. However, it can be enhanced in terms of brevity and effectiveness by prioritizing the most crucial aspects and eliminating redundancy. The following enhancements are recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brevity: Simplify the terminology to make the abstract more concise. 2. Key Findings: Clearly highlight the most notable discoveries. 3. Cost-Benefit Analysis: Provide a concise overview of the economic consequences. <p>Suggested Revision: The investigation sought to examine the efficacy of several pesticides on the larval population of the gram pod borer (<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>) in chickpea plants, as well as the corresponding cost-benefit ratio. The experiment was carried out at the Entomology Research Field of DDU Gorakhpur University. It employed a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with seven treatments that were reproduced three times. According to the findings, the application of Spinosad at a concentration of 0.20ml/l was the most successful treatment. It resulted in a considerable decrease in larvae populations and led to the maximum yield of chickpeas. The therapy with Emamectin benzoate at a concentration of 0.4g/l showed the second highest level of effectiveness. The economic research demonstrated that Spinosad exhibited the most favorable cost-benefit ratio. These findings offer useful information for optimizing pest management strategies in chickpea cultivation.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the text are generally suitable and conform well to the established conventions of scientific reporting. The primary divisions consist of an Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion, each offering essential particulars. The Introduction provides the background information and goals of the study, while the Materials and Methods section thoroughly describes the experimental setup and the treatments used. The Results and Discussion sections are merged, presenting the findings and their implications simultaneously, which is useful but might potentially be enhanced by being split to improve clarity. The Conclusion concisely highlights the main discoveries and their importance. In general, the framework facilitates effective</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The work demonstrates scientific rigor and technical proficiency through its clearly stated experimental design and comprehensive methodology. Implementing a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with many replications guarantees the dependability and replicability of the outcomes. Thorough data gathering and statistical analysis, which includes examining cost-benefit ratios, allow for a full assessment of the effectiveness of different insecticides. Moreover, the study's conclusions are strongly substantiated by quantitative data on larval populations and yield, which enhances the legitimacy and practicality of</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The manuscript has a combination of historical and modern references, which is crucial for offering a thorough background and context. Nevertheless, certain important sources, such as the works of Singh and Diwakar (1995), Chavan et al. (1987), and Manjunath et al. (1989), are much outdated. Although the</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>accurately represent the current state of research and developments in the subject.</p> <p>The incorporation of studies up to 2024, as indicated by the provided sources, implies a deliberate attempt to assimilate the most recent discoveries. However, in order to improve the manuscript's significance and scientific validity, it would be advantageous to do a literature review to ensure that the most up-to-date and relevant research are incorporated, especially those published within the last 5-10 years. This will guarantee that the document is current with the most recent advancements and</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article's language and English proficiency are generally appropriate for scholarly communications, while there are areas where enhancements might be implemented to improve clarity and readability. Here are some precise details:</p> <p>1. Grammar and Syntax: Verify that sentences adhere to grammatical rules and are syntactically unambiguous. The abstract and body of the work may benefit from more concise language.</p> <p>2. Conciseness: Certain sections, notably the abstract, can be made more succinct to eliminate repetition and enhance legibility.</p> <p>3. Technical Terminology: It is OK to utilize technical words, but it is important to provide clear definitions when they are initially introduced in order to enhance understanding for a wider audience.</p> <p>4. Consistency: Ensure uniformity in the use of terms and layout across the whole manuscript. For instance, it is important to regularly use either the complete scientific names or acronyms following the initial mention.</p> <p>5. Clarity: Ensure that intricate concepts are elucidated clearly, and contemplate dividing lengthy sentences into shorter, more accessible ones.</p> <p>6. Proofreading: Conducting a comprehensive proofreading to identify and correct typographical problems, punctuation mistakes, and inconsistencies in referencing styles can enhance the overall quality.</p> <p>By attending to these specific aspects, the work will be more fit for intellectual discourse and readily comprehensible to the academic community.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall , this manuscript discusses a significant subject in agricultural pest control, presenting conclusions that are both clear and pertinent. Integrating a cost-benefit analysis provides tangible benefits for farmers and policymakers. To enhance the text, it is advisable to partition the Results and Discussion parts in order to achieve more clarity and concentration. In addition, enhancing the research's contemporary relevance can be achieved by incorporating more recent studies into the references. Ultimately, conducting a comprehensive proofreading to ensure grammatical accuracy and language consistency will improve readability and guarantee that the work fulfills rigorous scholarly requirements. These enhancements will facilitate the clear and efficient communication of the noteworthy contributions of this research.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rungkiat Kawpet
Department, University & Country	Suan Dusit University, Thailand