

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_121166
Title of the Manuscript:	Susceptibility of Groundnut Genotypes/Varieties against Spodoptera litura (Fab.) with respect to Leaf Damage
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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The importance of this manuscript for scientific community is dependable to the treatments whether released or yet to release. Also the results are not described along with morphological differences among the treatments and weather data during the growing period of the crop. If this information is included in the manuscript, the quality will get improve.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Minor change in title...since <i>Spodoptera litura</i> is a scientific name, instead of Groundnut its botanical name should be used. In complete manuscript including title, genotypes/varieties is used multiple times, suggested is that use only one term either genotypes or varieties as both terms technically have different meaning.</p> <p>Obliques (/) should not be a part of title</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The statistical design used for analysis should be incorporated in the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>In the 3rd line of 1st paragraph of introduction the sentence starts as ...India comes ranked secondplease delete one word either comes or ranked.</p> <p>Starting of 3rd paragraph of introductionthere is scanty information of <i>S. litura</i>this part is is questionable as loads of information are there on internet and libraries.</p> <p>Use only one term either genotypes or variety which should be technically correct to the treatments used.</p> <p>Add recent references to the information mentioned in introduction.</p> <p>In material and methods ...instead of the term plot size ...plot dimension should be preferable. or plot size should be written as 4.5m²</p> <p>Please mention the source of scale used for categorising treatments... If possible please add year of release of the treatments if they are released (no need if under channel)</p> <p>In results and discussion part...only pooled data is described ...the results at vegetative stage .. flowering stage and post flowering stage are not describes as the level/category of resistance at this stage may be different than pooled results for treatments. On this basis it can also tell us about the resistance in treatment at that particular stage.</p> <p>While describing results, mention the range of damage at each stage and arrange the treatments in either descending order or ascending order of the per cent damage.</p> <p>In table 2., the title of column 3 is leaf damage % and the original values are mentioned in parenthesis. That is technically wrong. Mention transformed values in parenthesis and original values outside.</p> <p>Last column of table 2 is pooled ...or pooled mean</p> <p>In discussion, only 2 references are mentioned and are not correlated with experiments results whether they are parallel or different. The reasons are also not mentioned. It is expected that the author should discuss the reasons behind the output along with added references.</p>	

Review Form 3

	Conclusion should be clear. It should conclude the results to readers. Here it is same as in results and discussion. or one can say ...the results and conclusion of the manuscript are having copy paste pattern.	
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.	Since it is a screening of 30 treatments it will be very useful to readers and farmers subject to technical corrections and proper presentation of the topic. Also describe the morphological differences among the treatments (specifically in leaves) and also add weather data of crop growing period.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are too less. add more and recent references	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is suitable still It can be improved.	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dhaneshwar Bhagawan Patil
Department, University & Country	Dr. Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, India