

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125920
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of the insecticidal effect of the essential oils Ocimum basilicum and O. gratimum on Cyclas puncticollis sweet potato weevil in Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript presents valuable information on the insecticidal efficacy of essential oils from <i>Ocimum basilicum</i> and <i>Ocimum gratissimum</i> against <i>Cyclas puncticollis</i> , a pest that threatens sweet potato production in Burkina Faso. The findings contribute to the growing body of research on botanical insecticides, offering potential eco-friendly alternatives to synthetic pesticides. The focus on local plant species reveals the relevance of traditional knowledge in modern pest management strategies. In all, this study is commendable for addressing both scientific and practical concerns in agriculture.	Thank you for this good appreciation.
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title, while informative, could be more specific. A suggested alternative could be: " <b>Comparative Efficacy of <i>Ocimum basilicum</i> and <i>Ocimum gratissimum</i> Essential Oils Against <i>Cyclas puncticollis</i> Infesting Sweet Potatoes in Burkina Faso.</b> " This title better reflects the comparative nature of the study and highlights the context of the research.	Yes, I agreed with the reviewer suggestion to improve the title of the paper.
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is generally comprehensive, summarizing the study's aim, methodology, and key findings. However, it could benefit from including <u>specific mortality rates observed at different concentrations and time intervals</u> to give readers a clearer understanding of the results. Additionally, mentioning the potential implications for pest management practices would strengthen the conclusion.	The following part of the abstract give a response to this query: "With <i>O. basilicum</i> essential oil, 100% mortality was observed after 24 hours of weevil exposure with <i>O. basilicum</i> concentrations of 125µL/L and 100µL/L, followed by 98% mortality with concentrations of 75µL/L, 50µL/L and 25µL/L after 96 hours".
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The manuscript's subsections and overall structure are appropriate. The logical flow from introduction to methods, results, and discussion allows for a coherent narrative. However, subheadings could be improved for clarity, particularly within the methods section, to clearly delineate between essential oil extraction and efficacy testing.	I've highlighted the methodology subsections in yellow. They clearly show the part dedicated to oil extraction and the part dedicated to the various tests.
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its use of well-established methodologies for extracting essential oils and assessing insecticidal effects. The statistical analysis is appropriate for the data, ensuring that the results are reliable and significant. Moreover, the study effectively contextualizes its findings within existing literature, reinforcing the validity of the results.	Thank you for your good appreciation.
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	The references cited in the manuscript are relevant, but some may be outdated. To enhance the manuscript, consider including more recent studies on the efficacy of botanical insecticides, such as works published in the last five years. Suggested references could include systematic reviews or meta-analyses on plant-based insecticides and their ecological impacts.	In fact, recent references on the subject under study are rare. Nevertheless, I've added a few more recent ones.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing should be corrected to improve clarity and readability. The author(s) should consider using the grammarly to polish the manuscript.	I have improved the manuscript at the best of my knowledge.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript addresses an important topic with significant implications for agricultural practices in Burkina Faso. While the research design is robust, the addition of more detailed data presentation (e.g., figures or tables summarizing results) would enhance clarity. Furthermore, addressing potential limitations and future research directions in the discussion could provide a more comprehensive perspective.	Tables 1 and 2 were converted into figures.

Review Form 3

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	No. There is none.