

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_76268
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Bio-pesticides on mortality of Greater wax moth <i>Galleria mellonella</i>
Type of the Article	Original/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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>1. Grammatical errors are present, please revise the manuscript to remove any possible grammatical and typos errors (like 'where' & 'name' oil in abstract).</p> <p>2. Please make the title more informative (including suggested addition - greater wax moth, <i>Galleria mellonmela</i> "L.")</p> <p>3. Kindly make the abstract structured, as the current version of the abstract is unstructured (only contains results). Provide a few lines about introduction, methods and concluding results. The abstract also contains an undefined abbreviation (Btk), please avoid and expand at its initial occurrence.</p> <p>4. Introduction lacks information. Please provide recent updates and the significance of the study being conducted. It contains an undefined abbreviation (GWM), please avoid and expand at its initial occurrence.</p> <p>5. Material and methods seem incomplete. No information is provided regarding: a) Preparation of Btk and neem oil (except custard apple seed extract). b) No information about their source etc is provided for the samples (GWM and <i>A. mellifera</i>).</p> <p>6. Results do not give much insightful information about the study, please make it more intensive. Statistical data is also missing in the manuscript.</p> <p>7. Conclusion – Please mention which biopesticide is more effective and can be used for commercial purposes.</p> <p>Necessary/required additions</p> <p>1. Only single treatments were studied in the study. The suggestion is to use different combinations of the biopesticides to evaluate further which combination is better.</p> <p>2. Statistical analysis should also be presented.</p> <p>3. LC50 values should also be computed.</p> <p>4. The current study includes only lab-based analyses. Please confirm field studies were also conducted for the same to confirm the lab-based results. If not, it is also recommended for the study purpose.</p>	<p>1. Manuscript was revised as per the suggestions.</p> <p>2. Abstract was structured and added desire information as per suggestion.</p> <p>3. Introduction was updated as per suggestion.</p> <p>4. The preparation procedure of <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> and neem oil was included in the materials and methods. Source of Greater wax moth and <i>Apis mellifera</i> information was also included.</p> <p>5. Results of the study were revised as per the suggestions.</p> <p>6. The best findings of the study was given in conclusion as per suggestions.</p> <p>Necessary/required additions</p> <p>1. No combination of bio-pesticides was used in the current study. It can be mention in further studies.</p> <p>2. Statistical analysis was given in the tables.</p> <p>3. LC 50 value was not calculated in the present investigation.</p> <p>4. This study was conducted in the lab, field confirmation was not done. It can be apply in future study.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Authors are requested to format the manuscript thoroughly as there is no space between words.</p> <p>2. Introduction seems incomplete and lacks current knowledge and please make it more informative.</p> <p>3. References mentioned at the end are missing in the text.</p> <p>4. Is Swamy et al., 2003c provided in the reference list same as Swamy et al 2003 in the text.</p>	<p>1. The Manuscript was revised as suggestions.</p> <p>2. All the necessary information was included in the introduction part.</p> <p>3. Desired references were included in the text.</p> <p>4. Swami et al., 2003 corrected in the references section.</p>

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
---------------------------	--	--

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)	No.