

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 <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.	Pear psylla has been reported cause significant damage to fruit industry. A study about its biology and developmental stages under climate of specific area like wise mentioned in manuscript about Kashmir would not only help to understand the damage but will also help to pave a path towards developing successful management practices.	
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.	The abstract cover the major findings of the study and highlights the developmental stages of psylla however a single line about major damaging stage can be added.	
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.	The manuscript is correct however, this looks like the research was done to support previous findings of the work carried out in past. The author must focus on how pear psylla developed in this particular region of Kashmir by highlighting the time of year when the most damaging stage of psylla was active it would help in developing the spray schedule for the pest.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments	Language is suitable but proof reading is required.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Kindly label the different stage of diagram where author have shown photographs of different instars.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shiv Kumar Shivandu
Department, University & Country	IARI New Delhi, India