

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121264
Title of the Manuscript:	Biophysical Factors Influencing Fall Armyworm Damage in Maize: Insights from Morphological Traits and Cob Characteristics
Type of the 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)
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.	Yes, it is very important because the topic authors selected for study is the burning issue in maize plants and this study is also useful to planning for pests management	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, title is suitable	
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, abstract is appropriate to manuscript, minor corrections to be needed	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, subsections which is given by authors is suitable to his study	
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.	Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct, but some minor corrections are there due to lack of carefully reading on authors guideline section of this journal by author. But it is normal. I have suggested all the modifications which are necessary to publish.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	References are very less...please add the references in introduction, only one reference was given in the introduction part. How it is possible? Please add according to the suggestions suitable and recent but carelessly prepared. Request to author please modified it according to guideline.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Manuscript write by author is very nice but some minor corrections are needed. Hence, Kind request to author please read carefully the suggestions given by me in manuscript. All are minor corrections. Modify it accordingly.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Devanand Rajaram Bankar
Department, University & Country	Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, India