

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_127105
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of cashew varieties against apple and nut borer, <i>Thylocoptila paurosema</i> (Phycitidae: Lepidoptera)
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.	The research study is important for the humanity and the scientific community. Though, the significance of the study was clearly stated, the author failed to clearly indicate the objectives in the Introduction. Objectives must be clear and measurable. The objective as stated below is vague. "It is essential to evaluate the suitable management practice based on sound ecological principles. Looking at the emerging insect pest problems in cashew the present study on screening of cashew varieties was evaluated against apple and nut borer". Objectives must be itemized according to what the author would like to achieve in the study. The significance and importance of the determination of Biochemical analysis of different parameters like Vitamin C, Titratable acidity and Tannin must be explained for continuity	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggested Title from what the reviewer understands from the paper Assessment of suitable management practice based on sound ecological principles of cashew varieties against apple and nut borer <i>Thylocoptila paurosema</i> (Phycitidae: Lepidoptera)	
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.	Conclusion is lacking in the Abstract	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Results (data) may be tabulated for an organized recording of data and easy understanding of the readers	
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 Experimental details is very ambiguous and vague. The study is about food. The detailed experimental procedure, from picking of the fruit to the counting etc. must be elaborately indicated. This must include safety measures (use of gloves, clean equipment/storage etc) and scientific method on how the author go about the process is very important. Photos of the food, insects, experimental procedure may help.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Additional reference may be included if reviewer's comments is acknowledged/done.	
Minor REVISION comments	There are a number of grammar errors. "Grammarly" is suggested	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Lola Domnina B. Pestano
Department, University & Country	University of Santo Tomas, Philippines