

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JABB_118097
Title of the Manuscript:	Population dynamics of spotted stem borer, <i>Chilo partellus</i> (Swinhoe) and pink stem borer, <i>Sesamia inferens</i> (Walker) on rabi sorghum
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript entitled "Population dynamics of spotted stem borer, <i>Chilo partellus</i> (Swinhoe) and pink stem borer, <i>Sesamia inferens</i> (Walker) on <i>rabi</i> sorghum" is a valuable contribution to the scientific community, particularly in the fields of agricultural entomology and pest control. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It provides critical insights into the seasonal population fluctuations of two significant pests, <i>C. partellus</i> and <i>S. inferens</i>, and their correlation with various weather parameters. Essential for developing effective pest management strategies and improving sorghum yield, crucial for food security in regions where sorghum is a staple crop. Findings can help predict pest outbreaks and tailor agricultural practices to mitigate crop losses, supporting sustainable agriculture. The title of the article is informative and does not need to be changed. I suggest that the authors rewrite the abstract to make it clearer. The current version does not convey the results clearly. Suggestion for a clearer abstract and the manuscript in general: Stop using the word "respectively" and instead write each parameter value next to it. Yes, the manuscript organization is acceptable, but I suggest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using unique titles for different sections of the results (e.g., change "Correlation studies" to "Correlation between weather parameters and <i>C. partellus</i> infestation"). Writing a concluding remark or a summary paragraph to end the manuscript. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. References are sufficient. <p>Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lines 25 and 28: Repetition of information: "In India, the area under sorghum crop is 4.09 million ha with the production of 3.47 million tonnes and the average yield of 849 kg per ha (FAOSTAT, 2020)." Line 42: Correct the spelling of "India." Line 68: Authors need to write the full description: "standard meteorological week" and the abbreviation (SMW), then they can use the abbreviation throughout the manuscript. Line 84: Correct spacing. Lines 95-96: Rewrite to improve clarity. Line 103: Capitalize "R" in Renga reddy Line 136: Add a full stop between "<i>rabi</i>" and "The." 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Line 178: Write "hrs" in full.○ Throughout the manuscript, the authors need to check the spacing between words and punctuation.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is	
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:	Rania Mohamed Hassan Baleela
Department, University & Country	University of Khartoum, Sudan