

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123985
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of potash application on incidence of bollworms in Bt cotton hybrid
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	I am not satisfied with the way this article is presented for journal. While the topic of this article is having potential practical applications, it is not written scientifically and completely. The data in the tables is not written in results and not discussed with the available literature. Unnecessarily many photos are dumped in the article. I suspect these tables and figures are prepared for thesis purpose and all are sent to journal without any modifications or processing. There is no meaning in simply dumping all the data without properly presenting in results and discussing then with suitable references. I found this article is not suitable for publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is mentioned 'Bt cotton hybrid' in the title. Name of the hybrid should be mentioned or can be written as 'Hybrid Bt cotton'	
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.	NO. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Only headings of subsections are there. Not single sub section is completely written.	
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.	This manuscript is not scientifically written. It appears like all the data recorded for some research purpose is simply dumped here. There are about 18 tables mentioned, but both the results and discussion parts completed in less than ONE PAGE. Not a single table is mentioned in the article text under results. I wonder how they written results without mentioning a single table or figure number.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are about 9 pages of references but Not a single reference cited under the 'References' section is mentioned in the article text.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	This manuscript should not be accepted in its current form. The ignorance of the authors is clearly visible in preparation of this manuscript. While the satisfactorily good data is generated in this research, all the tables are dumped here without properly writing the results and discussion. The manuscript should be entirely re-written with complete introduction, methodology, results and discussion.	

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:	Mahendra K R
Department, University & Country	ICAR-IARI, India