

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122944
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF EXPOSURE AND ASSESSMENT OF DIVERSITY, ABUNDANCE OF INSECTS IN CABBAGE CROP USING YELLOW STICKY TRAPS
Type of the Article	Original 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)
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 study demonstrates the effectiveness of the Yellow sticky traps as trapping devices for the pests of cabbage crop. Outcomes of the study are interesting and have practical application. As trapping of natural enemies along with insect pests is the major concern about the use of YSTs, this study tried to address this problem and suggested potential solution.	
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, it is. Few corrections are suggested.	
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.	The methodology followed was suitable for this work. The kind of data analysed and presented was also scientifically correct. However few corrections were suggested regarding tables and results and requesting to attend them.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Need of more references of recent date in the discussion part. It will be more robust if results were supported by recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Many corrections are suggested in the manuscript. Paper could be published with all the corrections attended correctly.	

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:	Mahendra K R
Department, University & Country	ICAR – Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India