

**Review Form 3**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JABB_121983</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Assessment of <i>Melanagromyza obtusa</i> (Malloch) Infestation in Major Pigeonpea Growing Districts of Karnataka</b> |
| Type of the Article      |  |

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

| <b>Compulsory</b> 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.                        | Pod fly is a very devastating pest of pigeonpea. It causes a significant loss to pigeonpea yield. As it is difficult to diagnose the early symptoms it is necessary to know about the pest severity. In this study it is showing the severity of infestation in different localities of Karnataka. According to this the intensive management practices would be adopted. |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable?<br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)   | A minor change I have suggested. In case of "assessment" the word "survey" would fit better.<br>Survey of <i>Melanagromyza obtusa</i> (Malloch) Infestation in Major Pigeonpea Growing Districts 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.   | Yes, the abstract is well and good. I have suggested addition in the "key word" section.  |   |
| 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. | As it contains a survey of four districts. And the sampling size is also good.  |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   | I have suggested the reference of recent data of yield loss caused by pod fly.  |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  |   |   |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?   | Yes, it is good.  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  |   |   |
|   | Overall content of the article is sufficient for publication in my opinion.   |   |

### 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? | <u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u> |  |

### Review Form 3

#### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Saswati Premkumari</b>                    |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Mahayogi Gorakhnath University, India</b> |