

Review Form2

Book Name:	Current Research Progress in Agricultural Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2681
Title of the Manuscript:	Seasonal incidence of spotted pod borer (Marucavitrata F.) in Indian bean and correlation with meteorological aspects
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important but it is not enough for the book chapter.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Seasonal Occurrence of Spotted Pod Borer, <i>Marucavitrata</i> F. (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) in Indian bean and Correlation with meteorological aspects	
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.	It is ok	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is partially not scientifically and technically sound. It needs major revision.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient it needs a current work review	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Poor language written	
Optional/Generalcomments	The introduction part is very shallow and the gap of the study is not touched. The materials and method part is also very weak, making it strong. The result part is also not well explained. Lack of discussion part	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tadele Shiberu
Department, University & Country	Ambo University, Ethiopia