

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122024
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTIVENESS OF BAGGED AND STRUCTURED REFUGIA AGAINST COTTON BOLLWORMS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

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.	This research work is very important because Bt cotton got resistance against bollworms especially pink boll worm. To mitigate resistance among PBW population towards Bt cotton, refugia cotton crop cultivation as non Bt is necessary along with Bt cotton.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, I suggested as "Comparison and evaluation of bagged and structured refugia against cotton bollworms"	
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.	I suggested on original article as tracking .	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Statistical analysis is very poor, must be improve as indicate on original article by trackning	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, I suggest that auther may incorporate more references in discussion of his work.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Suggested comments in tracking may be incorporated.2. Only one year data cannot full fill the scope of this manuscript title.(If necessary for one year it should be short communication article)3. Statistical analysis is very poor.4. Discussion of results very poor. The author claimed that very little research work of refugia in bag or structured in world is not justified. A lot of published work is available that was done in India. So I suggest that auther may incorporate more references in discussion of his work.A latest research work published in India in 2023.	

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:	M. K. Nadeem Bhutta
Department, University & Country	Pakistan