

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125415
Title of the Manuscript:	Distribution and Dominance of Lepidopteran Pests in Maize across Himachal Pradesh, India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The scientific community should take note of this work since it sheds light on the dynamics of lepidopteran pests in maize crops, specifically in the setting of Himachal Pradesh. Findings highlight the need for focused pest control measures that can reduce economic losses in agriculture by determining the location and relative abundance of important pests such as <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> and <i>Chilo partellus</i>. This publication furthers our understanding of pest behavior in connection to crop growth phases and is commendable for its comprehensive examination and lucid explanation of results. It also aligns with previous studies. If we want to improve food security in the area and create more efficient farming methods, this study is essential.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title accurately describes the breadth of the study; thus I think it's fine. It shows that scientists in Himachal Pradesh are concentrating on the prevalence and spread of pests in maize. The geographical and methodological components of the work may be better highlighted with a more precise title, such "Geospatial Analysis of Lepidopteran Pest Dominance in Maize Across Two Agro-Climatic Zones in Himachal Pradesh, India," if that would be necessary or "Assessment of Lepidopteran Pest Dynamics in Maize: Dominance of <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> and Implications for Targeted Management in Himachal Pradesh"</p> <p>This alternative title highlights both the key findings and the practical significance of the research.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>A concise and well-written abstract that covers all the bases in terms of the study's goals, methods, and results. Nevertheless, a quick overview of the real-world consequences for approaches to pest control would be helpful.</p> <p>Ideas for Enhancement: Finally, include a statement summarizing the potential impact of the results on sustainable maize production in the area and how they could guide focused pest control efforts.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections are organized in a way that makes sense and leads logically from one part to another. It is easy to navigate the document because it follows a typical research format. To prevent repetition and make the story flow more smoothly, several parts, like the "Results" and "Discussion," might be combined or cross-referenced better.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Both the scientific evidence and the technical aspects of the manuscript are solid. The study question is well-suited to the data gathering and analysis procedures. A solid foundation for comprehending pest dynamics can be found in the application of relative abundance and dominance metrics for pest species.</p> <p>Ideas for Enhancement: The text might be strengthened by including a more comprehensive statistical study of the environmental factors that impact the number of pests across different zones. To make the results more understandable, it would be helpful to explain the study's limitations, such as its short time frame (just one growing season).</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>Important research on maize pests and agricultural management is included in the references, which are both adequate and pertinent. The background portion might use some updating, though, with studies that look at how climate change is affecting pest dynamics in comparable places.</p> <p>Additional References Suggestions: Be sure to incorporate up-to-date research on the worldwide distribution of <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> into your analysis of South Asian and related pest problems. Research in Southeast Asia and East Africa can give useful background information for this comparison.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Indeed, the vocabulary is well-suited for academic discourse. Although the manuscript is well-written, it may benefit from some sentence rearrangement and minor grammar adjustments to make it more clear and easier to read.</p> <p>Ideas for Enhancement: To make things easier to understand, go back and rework a few long sentences. When comparing and contrasting new findings with previous studies, be careful to use the same tense throughout.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Lepidopteran pests of Himachal Pradesh maize are better understood thanks to this manuscript. To make it better, it needs an economic study of how these pests affect corn yields and farmers' livelihoods; this would show how urgent it is to find solutions. The results may have more bearing on worldwide agricultural problems if we also consider how pest populations may shift as a result of climate change. Improving the study's practical consequences for agricultural stakeholders and making it more applicable to real-world scenarios could be achieved by engaging with local farmers to collect qualitative perspectives on their pest management strategies. In the grand scheme of things, these improvements would make the document even more useful for agricultural pest management.</p>	

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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chinglembi Laishram
Department, University & Country	ICAR-NIAP (National Institute of Agricultural Economics and Policy Research), India