

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	AsianResearchJournalofAgriculture
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_ARJA_125160
TitleoftheManuscript:	InvestigationonthebiologicalcharacteristicsandthermalrequirementsofeggparasitoidTrichogrammatoideabactraeoneggsofcottonPinkbollworm
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearchArticle

PART1: ReviewComments

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)
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.	The study is relevant to the scientific community (Professors, researchers, etc.), but mainly to producers in cotton-producing regions around the world.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is appropriate.	
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.	The approach taken in the abstract is wrong, as the authors did not use the correct statistical test.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the 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.	This manuscript does not demonstrate a rigorous use of experimental design and clear methodology. The authors used statistical analysis in a completely erroneous manner. This resulted in the results not being correctly analyzed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are no problems regarding references.	

ReviewForm3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Isthe language/English quality of the articles suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the quality of the language/English of the article is suitable for academic communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Some questions are raised as a way of.</p> <p>The results found in this study and those found by Malik (2001) did not differ as stated in the text.</p> <p>What statistical design was adopted in the experiment? It is important to clarify this in the text (materials and methods).</p> <p>What statistical software was used to perform the statistical analyses and draw conclusions from the study? It is important to clarify this in the text (materials and methods).</p> <p>It was stated in the text that regression was used, but what is mentioned in the text is a multiple comparison test of means and not a regression. It is important to clarify this in the text (materials and methods). Through this, conduct a regression analysis to better explain the results.</p> <p>The study factor is a quantitative factor, and therefore a mean comparison test can be applied to compare the treatments; regression analysis should be used instead. Therefore, when choosing regression analysis, it is advisable to estimate the degrees of the polynomial through orthogonal contrasts, which aim to know the significance of the polynomials. Next, estimate the regression parameters (estimate their significance).</p> <p>The importance of choosing regression analysis for this study is based on the following: with the treatments chosen at 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, and 34°C, it is possible that the ideal temperature is not any of these, but rather between them. For example: 27°C. This is only possible with regression analysis.</p> <p>With this, all conclusions drawn from this study are misguided. I strongly suggest that the entire statistical analysis be done and then the results be rewritten to draw much more effective conclusions.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Carlos Zacarias Joaquim Júnior</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Santa Catarina State University, Brazil</p>