

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	

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript titled Evaluation Of Feeding Potential Of Mexican Beetle (ZYGROGAMMA BICOLORATA) On Carrot Grass (PARTHENIUM HYSTEROPHORUS) In Dehradun District, Uttarakhand' is well-researched and provides a comprehensive analysis of the challenges and issues encountered by both farmers and traders in the broiler market. It offers valuable insights and practical recommendations for improving the marketing processes, making it a significant contribution to the field.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article, "Evaluation Of Feeding Potential Of Mexican Beetle (ZYGROGAMMA BICOLORATA) On Carrot Grass (PARTHENIUM HYSTEROPHORUS) In Dehradun District, Uttarakhand" is suitable as it clearly indicates the scope and focus of the research, providing a precise overview of the study's content.</p> <p>3. The abstract is good.</p> <p>4. The structure is correct</p> <p>5. Please add more words in the introduction is about 600 words, covering the aims of the research and providing an adequate background, avoiding a detailed literature survey or a summary of the results. Also, I do not find the discussion in the text, thorough discussion represents the causal effect mainly explains why and how the results of the research were taken place, and do not only re-express the mentioned results in the form of sentences.</p> <p>6. All references mentioned in the Reference list are cited in the text, and vice versa</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. I found a lot of grammatical errors, please edit it or better, if it is revised by a professional science editor or a native English speaker</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Whisnu Febry Afrianto
Department, University & Country	Indonesia