

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_128014 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | COMPARATIVE EFFICACY OF INSECTICIDES AGAINST FALL ARMYWORM (<i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>) IN BABY CORN |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses a critical issue in sustainable agriculture—managing the fall armyworm, a major pest impacting baby corn production. By evaluating the efficacy of various insecticides, the study provides valuable insights into optimizing pest control strategies, ensuring not only crop productivity but also economic viability for farmers. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | yes | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <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>To evaluate whether the abstract is comprehensive and provide suggestions for improvement, consider the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key Focus and Objectives: Ensure the abstract clearly defines the aim of the study, emphasizing the importance of managing the fall armyworm in baby corn for improved productivity and profitability. 2. Methodology: Briefly outline the experimental design, including the insecticides tested and how efficacy was measured. Adding this will provide readers with a snapshot of the study's approach. 3. Results: Highlight the key findings, such as the most effective insecticides or significant trends observed. This helps readers understand the practical implications without needing to delve into the full text. | |
| <p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Methodology Details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The description of insecticides used (e.g., formulation concentrations, application methods) is clear, but including specifics about environmental conditions (temperature, humidity) during the experiment can add depth to the study's replicability. ○ Mention the statistical tools or software used for analyzing the data. 2. Analysis of Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure that statistical significance (e.g., p-values) supports the claims regarding the superiority of T2 and T3 treatments. ○ Clarify if there were any interactions between the treatments and environmental factors influencing efficacy. 3. Discussion and Broader Implications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Expand on how these findings align or contrast with previous studies on fall armyworm management. ○ Discuss the potential impact of these treatments on non-target organisms and environmental safety. 4. Conclusion Validity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The conclusion is consistent with the results, highlighting the cost-effectiveness and efficacy of T2 and T3. Ensure it avoids overgeneralization, limiting claims to the specific conditions of the study. <p>Final Assessment:</p> <p>The manuscript appears scientifically correct, with clear objectives, robust methodology, and valid conclusions. However, minor clarifications in methodology and a broader discussion of implications could further strengthen its scientific rigor and applicability.</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 number of referenced papers is insufficient; additional relevant studies should be incorporated to strengthen the manuscript.</p> | |
| <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The language of the article is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication, but it can benefit from refinement to enhance its professionalism and readability.</p> | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | | |

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|--|
| Name: | D. Sheema |
| Department, University & Country | Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology, India |