

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121983
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of <i>Melanagromyza obtusa</i> (Malloch) Infestation in Major Pigeonpea Growing Districts of Karnataka
Type of the 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)
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.	Pigeonpea <i>Cajanus cajana</i> (L.) is one of the important pulse crop being grown on 42.3 lakh ha in India with a production of 38.9 lakh tonnes. Low yield level in pigeonpea is mainly due to attack mainly due to attack of pest and diseases. In recent days, incidence of pod borers and mite has become bottleneck for pigeonpea yields. Among different insect pests, pod fly <i>Melanagromyza obtusa</i> known to attack pods as well seeds which resulted in more than 80 percent loss. Hence present manuscript is very relevant as it unravelled information on status of pod fly in pigeonpea growing areas.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Status of pigeonpea pod fly <i>Melanagromyza obtusa</i> (Malloch) in Northern parts of Karnataka	
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.	Nil	
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.	Regarding data given in the tables on population of podfly maggots as well as pupae per 100 pods seems to be very less. Hence it is most important to check, whether the population is for 100 pods or single pod.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	Good work	

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)	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K P Gundannavar
Department, University & Country	UAS, India