

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128584
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE TOXICITY OF SELECTED INSECTICIDES AGAINST THIRD INSTAR SPODOPTERA FRUGIPERDA POPULATIONS IN SOUTHERN INDIA
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: 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.	<p>NB. All words highlighted in yellow colour in MS have been corrected, modified or added .</p> <p>First of all, thank you very much for choosing me to referee this article as I work in the same field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The manuscript includes data necessary for scientific community. - The manuscript has a high effort for the author and the paper deals with important issue . - The manuscript is within the scope of the journal and the title clearly and sufficiently reflect its content. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes,	
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.	Yes,	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract of the article is comprehensive. - The introduction include enough background information. - The table is in little acceptable. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but he should write the year after the title directly.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The MS written in correct and satisfactory English.	
Optional/General comments	PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Magdy Youssef Mahmoud El-Kholy
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt