

**Review Form 3**

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

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	This study will be supplementation to the existing knowledge on the biology of red spider mite with little variation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>New suggested title: BIOLOGY OF RED SPIDER MITE (<i>Tetranychus urticae</i>) KOCH REARED ON BRINJAL LEAVES</b>	
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.	<b>Abstract may be modified little bit:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The life cycle of red spider mite consists of five major stages viz. egg, larva, protonymph, deutonymph and adult, and includes three quiescent stages in between these active stages viz. nymphochrysalis, deutochrysalis and teleiochrysalis</li> <li>• The values may be separated by a semicolon for more clarity</li> </ul>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction is loosely written. More literature needs to be cited to justify genesis of the work.</li> <li>• <b>Methodology:</b> please mention from where mites were collected for laboratory study</li> <li>• The sections and sub-sections of the manuscript have not been numbered</li> <li>• In-text references are not as per journal guidelines</li> <li>• Bibliography is also not as per the journal guidelines</li> </ul>	
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 MS is ok in its presentation of facts.            Figure 1: check the spelling of female            Tables: write sample number in each Table</p> <p>How did the authors measure sizes? Corresponding figures showing scale bar would be better for the paper. If not, authors should mention how the sizes (length, breadth and diameter were measured)</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	<p>There are only 5 references.</p> <p>Few latest references may be considered to be included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prajapati, C. P., Patel, P. S., Chandaragi, M. K., &amp; Deb, S. (2024). BIOLOGY AND MORPHOMETRICS OF RED SPIDER MITE, TETRANYCHUS URTICAE KOCH ON OKRA. <i>Biochemical &amp; Cellular Archives</i>, 24(1).</li> <li>2. Osman, M. A., Al Dhafar, Z. M., &amp; Alqahtani, A. M. (2019). Biological responses of the two-spotted spider mite, <i>Tetranychus urticae</i> to different host plant. <i>Archives of Phytopathology and Plant Protection</i>, 52(17-18), 1229-1238. (To explain the differences in observations)</li> <li>3. Natikar, P. K., Madhurima Vinod, M. V., Nandihalli, B. S., &amp; Balikai, R. A. (2017). Biology of two spotted spider mite, <i>Tetranychus urticae</i> Koch (Acarina: Tetranychidae).</li> </ol>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language of manuscript needs lot of improvement, and is not suitable for scholarly communications. Please revise	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The name of the institute has been repeated many times in the MS, it may be mentioned just once at the beginning in Methodology or just avoid mentioning the institute name in the main body of the MS.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Meena Yadav</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Maitreyi College, University of Delhi, India</b>