

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129874
Title of the Manuscript:	Biology and management of Spodoptera litura on cabbage in laboratory conditions
Type of the 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 interesting. It is very important for agriculture, especially in terms of environmentally friendly plant protection. It is necessary to know whether climate change also changes the life cycle of armyworms.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	Add a little information about the trend of the effect of each experimental treatment.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	This manuscript is scientifically correct, but there are some things that need to be revised: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: It is better to write the active ingredients of Spinosad and novaluron than the trademark. 2. Materials and Methods (Preparation of field): It is better to use standard units of weight measurement than use cartloads 3. Result and Discussion: Only result without discussion. Add in the discussion about previous researches about army worm. Do the studies contradict or support the results of your research? 4. Information in Table 1 and table 2 are overlapping. For avoiding this, add the minimum and maximum values in table 1, and delete Table 2. 5. Table 3 is confusing. There are empty datas in the observation column. Are they 0%? The suggestion is that the empty columns should be filled but by doing data transformation. Please find the appropriate type of data transformation if there is 0% and 100% in your data. 6. Conclusion: In the conclusion, just write the conclusion. There is no need to give the reason because it has been written in the discussion. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Old references. Suggestions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. https://smujo.id/biodiv/article/view/8063 2. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2095311920633676 3. https://indianentomology.org/index.php/ije/article/view/1980 	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is	
Optional/General comments	Needs a lot of revision but it is worthy to be published	

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:	Tri Wardhani
Department, University & Country	University of Widya Gama, Indonesia