

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121929
Title of the Manuscript:	Zinc Induced Resistant against yellow stem borer (<i>Scirpophaga incertulas</i>, Walker) in Rice
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The manuscript addresses the significant issue of pest resistance in rice, which is crucial for maintaining crop yields and food security. The focus on zinc-induced resistance against the yellow stem borer is particularly relevant given the need for sustainable agricultural practices. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more in-depth discussion of the broader implications of the findings for integrated pest management strategies. <input type="checkbox"/> The research appears to be scientifically robust, with well-designed experiments and clear presentation of results. The novelty of using zinc as a resistance-inducing agent in rice is commendable, but the manuscript would be strengthened by a more detailed comparison with existing resistance-inducing methods. <input type="checkbox"/> Overall, the study provides valuable insights for the scientific community, particularly in the fields of agricultural science and pest management. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable and clearly reflects the content of the manuscript. However, it could be slightly revised for clarity: "Zinc-Induced Resistance Against Yellow Stem Borer (<i>Scirpophaga incertulas</i> Walker) in Rice."</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 abstract is generally comprehensive, but it could be improved by briefly mentioning the methodology used and highlighting the key findings. For instance, include a sentence on how zinc was applied and the percentage of resistance observed.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure is appropriate, but the Results and Discussion sections could be more clearly separated to avoid confusion between the presentation of data and its interpretation.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically sound, with well-executed experiments and a logical flow of information. The use of zinc to induce resistance is innovative, but the manuscript would benefit from a more critical discussion of potential limitations and the need for further research in this area.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and mostly recent. However, consider including more recent studies on resistance-inducing agents and integrated pest management for a broader perspective.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is generally suitable, but there are a few areas where sentence structure could be improved for clarity. A thorough proofreading is recommended to enhance readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is a valuable contribution to the field, but a few minor revisions could significantly improve its impact. Consider expanding the discussion to include potential applications of this research in different rice-growing regions.</p>	

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:	Vipin Kumar Pandey
Department, University & Country	Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, India