

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128718
Title of the Manuscript:	Biology of Tobacco Caterpillar (<i>Spodoptera litura</i> Fabricius) on Castor Plants
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	<i>Spodoptera litura</i> is a serious pest of various economic important crops. The larva is voracious feeder and at last stage of development it can cause complete defoliation of the plants. In changing climatic scenario it is important to study such pest to find out impacts on the development and dispersion behaviour.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is correct, remove "Plants" after Castor in the 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.	Throughout the manuscript most of the scientific names are not Italicized. In abstract key findings are missing (Data). In this study only castor was taken for study and author concluded the castor as best host, it is contradictory. It was assessed based on the incubation period, larval period, pre-pupal period, pupal period, adult emergence, adult longevity, fecundity, incubation period, and total life span from the larvae reared on different hosts.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Most of it is correct. How author identified that it was exactly the same species that author described here. Write the key characteristics of adult and male, female identification in pupal stage.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference 24 is wrongly cited in the text.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Record of temperature and humidity, Photoperiod is not available in manuscript. Picture of female, male and female pupa (displaying key characteristics) is not clear.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Surendra Singh Shekhawat
Department, University & Country	SGT University, India