

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122898
Title of the Manuscript:	Fungus gnat a common contaminant of insect culture in glasshouse and protected cultivation.
Type of the 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.	The results of the research work done here is important to the entomological scientific community as well as it has posed some future recommendations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is okay but it should be justified in the centre and it does not have a full stop.	
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 suggest to write the outcomes of the present study in the last section of abstract. Also, author should write the hypothesis.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Titles of the subsections are not uniform (All subtitles are in capital but introduction is written in sentence case followed by a colon). Also, very less citations were given in the introduction section. I suggest to provide citations in the relevant places. I also suggest to include hypothesis in the introduction. Author should go thoroughly through the introduction as there is lack of flow between the paragraphs. In methods section, I suggest to mention geographical coordinates of the study area and use "flies" instead of "fly", wherever mentioned. Please provide any reference to why flies were maintained at 20°C. I suggest to provide the reason behind selection of particular gene for the study. Please provide the method used for the amplified PCR products and acknowledge the outsourced lab. In discussion section, I suggest to provide citations in the relevant places.	
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.	Line numbers are not there so it is difficult to review it. Font size of the manuscript is also not 12 which is considered as standard font size for an article. Line spacing is also not according to the standard measures.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Formatting of the references is not equal. Please equalize them.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Please correct the format of citation in few sentences. Bracket is missing in second paragraph's third line of results and discussion section.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Desh Deepak Chaudhary
Department, University & Country	Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, India