

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125980
Title of the Manuscript:	First global host report and new distribution record of <i>Bactrocera penecorrecta</i> Drew (Diptera: Tephritidae) from Bihar, India
Type of the Article	Research

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Overall, the manuscript contains valuable information on important pest that may become major pest in the future. This manuscript helps us to know about insect species that still prevail even after 22 years. Taxonomical identification of insects are basic study that plays an important role in applied science. This manuscript satisfies the basic criteria of novelty of research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of article is good and relevant	
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.	Yes, the abstract is fine and gives clarity to the manuscript in a compiled view.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I feel that the manuscript has to be refined regarding subsections and structure. The conclusion part is missing. Please add the conclusion and future prospects which is an important portion which explains the next level understanding of the research work.	
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.	Overall, the content of the manuscript has to be increased in order to make the manuscript more reliable. In the introduction part history and distribution of the pest has to be included nationally and globally in more descriptive form. Regarding materials and methods elaborated methodology has to be added like how the pinning had been done and what pin has been used for pinning etc., How the species had been identified morphologically? What are all the key morphological characters considered for identification has to be mentioned in a table format or text format. In the figures, d and e figure clarity has to be improved. Replace the images with good quality pictures if possible. Figure 1 caption has spelling mistake. The word "reard" should be changed as "reared" Images like the maggot feeding/infesting brinjal can be added.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Som more recent references should be added after 2020.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Muthu Lakshmi Bavithra C
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India