

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 (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.	The paper is well written for the importance of the scientific community, but didn't consider other factors such as temperatures, rainfall and soil types which are crucial for the population dynamic of pests. It also requires some editorial things and how the methodology was performed/used during survey. All these could be done to improve the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable to this article.	
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.	It is comprehensive but only missing the methodology which can be added in order to sound well and bring a strong meaning.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The numbering of both sections and subsections should be structured and indicated well so as to make the manuscript appropriate	
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.	The paper is good, but requires one more season to obtain results with no doubt and more descriptions needed in the methods section such as other factors (temperatures, rainfall and/or soil) required for the population dynamic of pests.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references are sufficient and recent. However, numbering of reference starts with 5 instead of 1. The author should strongly explain why the numbering of references begin with number 5.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication and the paper can be accepted with respect to addition of data in the next season and, the author should incorporate some corrections given and if possible indicate clearly the analysis used.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Emmanuel Chemu Miyashimbi
Department, University & Country	Tanzania Agricultural Research Institute (Kibaha Centre), Tanzania