

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126532
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative efficacy of various insecticides against flea beetle (<i>Phyllotreta cruciferae</i> Goeze and <i>Monolepta signata</i> Olivier), infesting rapeseed-toria (<i>Brassica rapa</i> L.) in Odisha
Type of the Article	Research 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 '**lack 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
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.	This manuscript principle may be used to our farmers to control insects and pests in their agriculture field to improve their yield and profits. Improve the analysis, how the insecticide control the insects.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Authors collected the data from agricultural land, a field study. Data were analysed properly.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not enough. Few more references may be included in introduction and result & discussion part.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Moderate	
Optional/General comments	<p>Comment 1: Authors used 'commas' before the conjunction 'and' (e.g. microbial, and novel). It can be avoided in the manuscript.</p> <p>Comment 2: Authors gave data for the reduction of the insects after application of the insecticides. But no explanation for the reasons of reduction of insects by the application of the insecticides.</p> <p>Comment 3: Authors mentioned the concentration of the insecticide T1 as T1: Azadirachta indica 300 ppm @2500ml/ha. But not mentioned the concentrations for the insecticides T2, T3 and T6.</p> <p>Comment 4: Authors gave figures for the percentage distribution of various insects. But no figures which confirms the percent reduction of insects after application insecticide treatment.</p> <p>Comment 5: Authors recorded data for that experiment three times after three times application of insecticides. But there was no comparative analysis between them.</p> <p>Comment 6: Authors concluded the effect of T5 in conclusion may be changed to another one way. Because it did not support the title of the manuscript.</p> <p>Comment 7: Authors will give reasons for the better effect of the insecticide T4 and poor effect of T5.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	B.Sri Suyambulinga Perumal
Department, University & Country	Vel Tech High Tech Dr Rangarajan Dr Sangunthala Engineering College, India