Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JABB_115523**
Title of the Manuscript:	**POPULATION DYNAMICS OF HELICOVERPA ARMIGERA IN CHICKPEA,(Cicer arietinum L.)**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	The manuscript titled "Population Dynamics of *Helicoverpa armigera* in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.)" provides valuable insights into the population dynamics of the gram pod borer insect pest, *H. armigera*, in chickpea crops. The study conducted at the Students' Instructional Farm (SIF) of Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture & Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya (UP), India, during the Rabi seasons of 2022-23 and 2023-24, offers significant findings. The study reveals that *H. armigera* infestation in chickpea crops initiates from the first fortnight of November, persisting until crop maturity, with peak infestation observed during the 7th and 8th Standard Meteorological Weeks (SMW) in both years. Furthermore, the research identifies a correlation between the population dynamics of *H. armigera* and weather parameters such as rainfall and wind speed, providing insights into the influence of environmental factors on pest population. The information generated in this study holds significance for devising pest management strategies aimed at enhancing production efficiency, profitability, and environmental safety in chickpea farming.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the content of the manuscript and effectively communicates the main focus of the research to potential readers. Therefore, it can be considered suitable for the article.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes, the abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study's objectives, methods, results, and implications, effectively summarizing the key aspects of the research for potential readers.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript structure appears appropriate, covering all essential components of a research paper, including introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusion, and references. Each section serves a specific purpose in conveying the study's objectives, methods, findings, and implications to the reader.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	The number of references seems adequate for supporting the research presented in the manuscript. They cover various aspects related to the population dynamics of *H. armigera* in chickpea crops, including seasonal occurrence, population fluctuations, and the impact of abiotic factors. While the references cover a range of relevant studies, it might be beneficial to include more recent sources to ensure that the research presented in the manuscript is based on the latest findings in the field.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language and English quality of the provided manuscript is suitable for scholarly communication.	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	The graphs included in the manuscript lack scientific relevance, as they do not accurately represent the data and only duplicate the information presented in the tables. Therefore, I recommend to eliminate the graphs and the discussion should focus only on the data provided in the tables. Also other changes and comments are made on the manuscript.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Iosob Gabriel-Alin**
Department, University & Country	**Vegetable Research and Development Station, Romania**