

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 <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.	The pest <i>Spodoptera litura</i> affects a variety of crops. The other side of pest control will become apparent if we have a thorough understanding of this biology. For both crop and non-crop plants, we can select the most effective pest management strategy if we truly understand the host preference.	
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.	No . Method and result should be consistent with the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	NO	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Need more references	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need better quality	
Optional/General comments	The abstract did not align with the methods or outcomes. Methods must be explicit. How many adults were hatched from the eggs is unknown. There was no count of the number of males and females. What number of females mated? Did every female produce fertilised eggs? There was no fecundity measurement. Mean values are not the sole data used in statistical analysis. Generally speaking, temperature, humidity, and food affect insect fertility or growth. This experiment does not describe the quality of each factor. I therefore recommend a major revision .	

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:	Swarnali Mukherjee
Department, University & Country	Raghunathpur College, India