

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARRB_123233</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Understanding the Impact: Insect Pests of Millets and Their Consequences on Yield Loss</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Comments:</b> The review article entitled " Understanding the Impact: Insect Pests of Millets and Their Consequences on Yield Loss" has represented the documented information in easily accessible format. There is a good information provided in the manuscript, but the authors have failed to present them in review article format. I have the following major concerns regarding the manuscript. If the issues are resolved, the quality of the manuscript would be improved. <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. There are many typos. The authors should check them thoroughly before submission.</li><li>2. Even though there is no strict format for a review article to follow, the author should have presented the information with a summarised conclusion.</li><li>3. There is lack of proper analysis and discussion on the issue highlighted in the title of the manuscript. There should be a proper discussion on the issue followed by necessary remedial steps to overcome the losses.</li><li>4. The data/information provided in the text could have been presented in table format.</li><li>5. Overall, the article needs a thorough revision and rewriting before accepting for publication.</li></ol>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yengkhom Bijen Kumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>