

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123472
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro compatibility and toxicity of Lecanicillium lecanii with insecticides against cotton aphids
Type of the Article	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

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>
<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>Repeated and indiscriminate application of synthetic insecticides has led to development of resistance in insects, and in many cases, a resurgence in their population, which disposes crops to a greater level of damage. This article highlights the significance of biopesticides, particularly entomopathogenic fungi (EPF), as a safe alternative to the chemical pesticides. This manuscript is believed to serve as a foundation for further research on development and use of biopesticides in the future.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is very catchy and suitable.</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>The abstract has been well-written. The authors are appreciated for presenting the abstract in a comprehensive, scientific and professional manner.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subheadings are apt and the manuscript is well-structured.</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 manuscript is scientific in its approach and presentation. However, the discussion part lacks integrity. The authors have only presented the findings of the previous works without explaining or citing proper reasons behind them. The authors are, therefore, advised to kindly explain their findings in the discussion part.</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 are sufficient, but recent works would be appreciated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is very scholar-friendly, and of high quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>None.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Swagat Ranjan Behera
Department, University & Country	G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, India