

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_123217</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of insecticides on generative potential of Entomopathogenic Nematode, Steinernema abbasi PN-1 in Spodoptera litura Fabricius</b>
Type of the 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**

<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 manuscript is important for possibility of using EMP under IPM implementation. The determining of the effect of different dose of insecticides on progeny of EMP is important to decide which active substance and which dose should be used properly to mixture EMP nematodes to work together. However, generally view of manuscript submission is very weak should be completely revised, supported with more literature and the should be edited with a native English language. Statistical discussion is very weak, there is no any explanation about statistical analysis in method.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Partly yes. However, table subtitle and general structure should be revised.	
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 important for possibility of using EMP under IPM implementation. The determining of the effect of different dose of insecticides on progeny of EMP is important to decide which active substance and which dose should be used properly to mixture EMP nematodes to work together. The comparison of Seven insecticides with three different doses, mixture EMP nematodes inside larva of <i>S. litura</i> including control treatments under laboratory conditions is hard both technically and scientific, therefore, it is important.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references not enough, the discussion is very weak, should be supported and discussed deeply.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is very simple it is not enough for scientific scholar communications. Some sentences are very weak and meaningless.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The method is to short and insufficient. There is no detailed information about establishing trials and statistical analysis, including progeny evaluation. It should be clear in method how studies have been done and concluded.  It should be revised and after major revision it could be accepted.	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Yunus Bayram</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Turkiye</b>