

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126576
Title of the Manuscript:	Biology and Developmental Stages of Pear Psylla (<i>Cacopsylla pyricola</i> Foerster) in Kashmir
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 '**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>

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.	Understanding the biology and lifecycle of the pest is important in devising pest management strategies. Hence the current study is important in this regard.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, Investigations on Biology and Life Cycle of Pear Psylla, <i>Cacopsylla pyricola</i> Foerster	
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.	Do corrections as suggested	
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.	Understanding the biology and lifecycle of the pest is important in devising pest management strategies. Hence the current study is important and adds to the scientific knowledge	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Still, more references are needed, quote as suggested	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chaitanya M
Department, University & Country	Indian Agricultural Research Institute, India