

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122423
Title of the Manuscript:	Feeding behavior of imidacloprid resistant brown planthopper, Nilaparvata lugens (Stål)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
<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>	<p>Research comments: A well-organized and elegant research paper presents findings that can be understood after thorough reading. The best scientific article contains evidence of research results. This scientific research paper is important for providing sufficient scientific information to breeders and rice entomologists working on developing anti-brown planthopper cultivars</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title of the Manuscript is appropriate and relevant to the research conducted by the scientists.</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>No modifications and corrections required in abstract part.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Some corrections and modifications were made in the subsection of the manuscript in the Material and Method chapter 2.3, specifically in the Feeding Test section on page 3. The corrections and modifications are highlighted in pink.</p> <p>Similar changes were made in Chapter 3 of the Results and Discussion. The corrections are incorporated and highlighted in red on page 4.</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 Brown Planthopper (BPH) <i>N. lugens</i> is the most serious and devastating pest on paddy, causing significant damage and economic losses to the farming community. Therefore, this research is very valuable for implementing appropriate control measures at the right time and stage of the crop. From the breeder's perspective, this work is extremely useful for making the right selection of BPH-resistant lines or tolerant varieties to provide to rice-growing farmers.</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 reviewed in the manuscript are acceptable and sufficient.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Ok no prolem</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is appropriate and timely for acceptance and publication.</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>	No ethical issues

Reviewer Details:

Name:	R.Kirankumar
Department, University & Country	India