

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_115746
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Weather Variables on Population of Maruca Vitrata (F.) and Efficacy of Different Insecticides Against Green Gram Vigna Rediata L
Type of the Article	Research article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is 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)	  1. Yes. The present article explains the effectiveness of different insecticides under influence of weather parameters against gram pod borer which is important pest of graminacoeus crops. However, the quality of article is so poor in accordance with scientific writing. It should be thoroughly revised before acceptance.  2. No. Title is poor and should be revised as "Efficacy of different insecticides in relation to weather parameters against gram pod borer, <i>Vigna radiata</i> L. in Prayagraj, U.P. India".  3. The abstract should be rewritten, it should be very specific, clearly state the purpose of work, statement of problem and major findings with future recommendations. 4. Yes. However, each subsection have much poor structure, all subsections should be revised like methodology, introduction, discussion. 5. Manuscript is correct, objective is good, but the writing quality, referencing, everything needs to be revised carefully.  6. No. References are insufficient and not much latest. At least should be 40 references, best is more than 50 references.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	  No. The present quality of article is unable to be accepted as scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Figures quality can be enhanced, add more recent information in introduction and discussion section. Elaborate more methodology and provide additional details. Add more recent references. Spell carefully. Focus on writing style. State clearly each aspect, provide complete information.	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Mehboob Hussain
Department, University & Country	Yunnan Agricultural University, China