

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 <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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the biophysical factors influencing fall armyworm damage in maize, highlighting the correlation between various morphological traits and pest infestation levels. The importance of this manuscript lies in its potential to guide the agricultural community in selecting and breeding maize varieties with specific traits that could mitigate pest damage. However, there is a lot of scope in improvement of the manuscript with addition of recommendation of this research at conclusion or end of discussion. Also, more details should be included in the manuscript in the introduction and the methodology section. .	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title looks good.	
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.	The abstract is long. The methodology section should be reduced and made concise. There is a section called sample which is not necessary. This should be included within the methodology section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The result and discussion sections could be separated but is not necessarily important. There are some subsections missing from the methodology like statistical analysis which must be included.	
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.	Article looks interesting and however, the article could be enhanced in the introduction and methodology sections. The results are well written but addition of more references for the discussion would be better. The conclusion should be improved. There is no information about how the data was analysed and which statistical tests were performed which must be added to make the article more robust scientifically.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No. The reference included is very few. More literature review is required in the introduction and the discussion section.	

Review Form 3

<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Abstract: The abstract should be made short and concise reducing the methodology and improving the conclusion.</p> <p>Introduction: Introduction is short and requires more information and references. It doesn't include the other relevant research performed on this topic. A paragraph with the research gap should be included adding recent literature and information. It should also include more information on status of fall army in the region, damage by fall armyworm in the maize, morphological traits and cob characteristics of maize, maize genotypes should be included with the references.</p> <p>Methodology: 1. Line says that "The maize crop was raised by following all the recommended practices except the plant protection measures." More details should be provided about what were the recommended practices.</p> <p>2. There is no information mentioned on how the damage score of fall armyworm was obtained. It should also include what was the level of fall armyworm and how it was measured.</p> <p>3. There is no information on data analysis. Sub sections must be added with information on how the data was analysed and what statistical analyses were performed.</p> <p>Result and Discussion: More reference is required for the discussion. The discussion is required on why some parameters were significant in 30 DAS but not at 60 DAS. There is discussion on each subtopic, but different morphological traits are related to each other. So, the inter relationship between the characters and how they differed with DAS and different inbreds should be included to make the article more robust.</p> <p>Conclusion: Conclusion should be more concise and understandable making a brief statement about what you can conclude from this article. It should also include about what are the implications or the recommendation from the study.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figure with the location site could be included in the article. Adding more details about the site is recommended with the geocoordinate of the site. 2. The research was conducted with only two replications. Three or more replication should have been conducted. 3. Information on what were the inbreds selected, how were obtained and how was their categories decided should be included in the method section. 4. Results can be presented in a better way making it easier for the readers to understand. The major findings can only be summarised in description. It is not necessary to describe everything from the table, major summary and results should be included. 5. I would recommend separating the result and discussion into separate sections. This would make article more easier to understand for the readers. 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kushal Naharki
Department, University & Country	West Virginia University, United States of America