

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_118364
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of Feeding Potential Of Mexican Beetle (ZYGROGAMMA BICOLORATA) On Carrot Grass (PARTHENIUM HYSTEROPHORUS) In Dehradun District, Uttarakhand
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, it is. The manuscript comprises an investigation on the biocontrol of carrot grass (<i>Parthenium hysterophorus</i>) using the Mexican beetle (<i>Zygogramma bicolorata</i>) by evaluating the feeding potential of the beetle.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>The abstract has room for improvement.</p> <p>The manuscript's scientific writing does not adequately communicate the authors' results to the audience.</p> <p>The introduction part certainly lacks the flow of the content. The authors have mixed up the information for Mexican beetle and Parthenium weed together. There is no justification, problem statement, or clear objectives stated at the end of the introduction part of the manuscript.</p> <p>Under the section, Materials and Methods: The authors have chosen 10 different study areas. However, the rationale behind choosing such locations (mentioned in the abstract), the kind of experiment carried out there, and the information gathered are not stated or expressed in detail in a clear way. There is no mention of the statistical analysis or experimental design.</p> <p>There are no relevant figures or tables that provide numerical data for the research study in the Results and Discussion section. The authors are unable to draw a firm conclusion from their research findings (see conclusion section). The conclusion written in the manuscript is more general.</p> <p>Yes, but it still lacks in justification, objectives, proper methodology and data representation.</p> <p>References indicated in introduction part could be improved.</p> <p>Cowie, B. W., Witkowski, E. T., Byrne, M. J., Strathie, L. W., Goodall, J. M., & Venter, N. (2018). Physiological response of <i>Parthenium hysterophorus</i> to defoliation by the leaf-feeding beetle <i>Zygogramma bicolorata</i>. <i>Biological Control</i>, 117, 35-42.</p> <p>However, authors failed to follow the referencing style that was preferred by the journal. Comments are given in the reviewed manuscript for the improvement.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The manuscript has been written poorly without explaining proper methods or experimental design, and the data for results is not in the manuscript in table or figure format. However, there still could be a chance for the authors to scientifically communicate their findings.</p> <p>Considering the paucity of information and lack of the current manuscript in each section mentioned above, this paper is rejected in its current state.</p> <p>However, the manuscript could be improved with the reviewers' comments and suggestions and may be reconsidered if the major suggestions are positively and seriously considered by the authors.</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:	Ganeshamoorthy Hariharan
Department, University & Country	Eastern University, Sri Lanka