

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123217
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of insecticides on generative potential of Entomopathogenic Nematode, Steinernema abbasi PN-1 in Spodoptera litura Fabricius
Type of the Article	Short 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)
<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 topic of the work is current, addressing a topic of interest for farmers and agronomists who develop integrated pest management methods. The paper work uses standardized methods found in similar studies that start from the same working hypothesis but for other species pairs. The material is well organized, logically structured, consistently focused on purpose, method, and results.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is well chosen to indicate as briefly as possible the purpose and content of the work. However, for clarity, I propose "Influence of Insecticides on the Reproductive Potential of <i>Steinernema abbasi</i> PN-1 in the Context of <i>Spodoptera litura</i> Control" or a shorter version "Influence of Insecticides on <i>Steinernema abbasi</i> PN-1 in <i>Spodoptera litura</i> Control"</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>The abstract contains exactly the parts that need to be mentioned and in the order they should be, starting with the purpose and importance of the study and ending with the usefulness of the results, which are very well summarized along with the material and method used.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The work is well-structured and where subsections are present, they are well-chosen because they make the sections easier to follow and understand.</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>The work protocol is clearly explained and the results are appropriate to the work method. However, I would suggest completing the work method by specifying the method used for statistics, possibly the software used, and the method of calculating progeny production. Also, if there are any, I think some images of the experiment performed would be helpful.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Almost half of the cited bibliographic titles are from the last 3 years. The citations are well chosen to show the state of research in the addressed topic and to compare the obtained results with existing bibliographic data. Citation number 7 should be reviewed to correct the citation style (year at the end).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language style and expression are appropriate and correct.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is not the case.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Prunar Florin
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences "King Mihai I" From Timisoara, Romania