

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123494
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOLOGY OF RED SPIDER MITE (<i>Tetranychus urticae</i>) KOCH ON BRINJAL
Type of the Article	Zoology

[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>
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.	This article is important for better understanding the development of pests in agricultural environments. Another key point is that knowledge about mites is still insufficient, and the data from this study helps to fill gaps in external morphological knowledge	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	BIOLOGY OF RED SPIDER MITE (<i>Tetranychus urticae</i>) KOCH ON BRINJAL 1835 (ARACHNIDA: TETRANYCHIDAE)	
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>The writing of the summary is good, but you can improve on the organization of ideas. Normally, a summary presents the main idea of the work and all the parts it includes in a straightforward manner. When I read the summary, I missed the objective and a brief conclusion, as remember that the summary is the initial part that will encourage the reader to continue reading and use it as a reference. Consider the possibility of rewriting it and look at other works as models.</p> <p>The keywords have more than eight words, as suggested by the journal's guidelines. You could use only the following words: egg, larva, chrysalis, nymph, adult, and morphometrics. The term 'morphometrics' suggests that the study involves rearing and includes rearing data</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, As subsections and structure of the manuscript are 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.	<p>The writing of the introduction is clear and objective, which is commendable. However, I believe that this introduction would be more effectively utilized in the summary. You might consider using the current introduction in place of the summary and crafting a more detailed introduction that includes references.</p> <p>The idea of the introduction is good, but it could be improved in the organization of ideas. For example, you could write more effectively about the studied species because the reader may not know about the organism's morphology as you do.</p> <p>You can better describe the external morphology and state the differences between this mite and others of the same genus.</p> <p>You can provide more details about the crops where this mite is found.</p> <p>I noticed a brief description of the organism; you can elaborate more on these points.</p> <p>A suggestion for organizing ideas is: 1) write about the class and then about the family; 2) describe the differences of the mite <i>Tetranychus urticae</i>; 3) then write about its importance or the crops where it is considered a pest; 4) the objectives of the work; 5) the location of the material you used for conducting the research.</p> <p>I did not find the references used in the paper included in the introduction.</p> <p>Review the file, as introductions help convey the ideas and also make it easier to demonstrate the relevance of the study.</p>	

Review Form 3

	An introduction without references is a text without history because we do not know the problem you are addressing or how it contributes to future studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are good and up to date, but you could use some older references to show the reader that this organism has been studied before, though not from the perspective you are taking in your work. Also, check if the writing complies with the journal's guidelines. Should the year of older references be placed at the end or before the title of the cited works?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly, but I suggestd uma revision.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The biggest problem with the article is the organization of the summary, which needs to be reworked. The writing of the introduction is better suited to a summary. When reading the introduction, no references were found, which is why I suggest a rewrite to improve the readability of the work and the value of the data analyzed.	

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:	Lucas Pessanha Mousinho
Department, University & Country	Universidade De Brasília, Brazil