

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Current Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJO CR_12653
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFICACY OF NATIVE BACILLUS THURINGIENSIS BERLINER ISOLATES AGAINST DIAMOND BACK MOTH, PLUTELLA XYLOSTELLA (LINNAEUS) AND ITS COMPATIBILITY WITH COMMON INSECTICIDES
Type of the Article	Research article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	To control agricultural pests, sustainable and eco-friendly biological control agents are necessary. Different types of pests require different and effective control agents. Efficacy and effectiveness should be determined in a laboratory and in the field before large-scale production of the biocontrol agents. So, these types of research activities are necessary for confirmation of the biological control agents.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Rewrite the title as EFFICACY OF NATIVE BACILLUS THURINGIENSIS BERLINER ISOLATES AGAINST <i>PLUTELLA XYLOSTELLA</i> (LINNAEUS) AND ITS COMPATIBILITY WITH COMMON INSECTICIDES	
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.	No. The length of the abstract is short. Please go through the author's guidelines. There is no background, method, or conclusion included in the abstract. Only the result is presented in the abstract. To my knowledge, the keywords should be the words in the Abstract. The keyword provided "insecticidal activity" is not in the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes. The prepared manuscript doesn't meet the author's guidelines. So, rewrite the manuscript as described in authors' guidelines.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are insufficient and not recent. The in-text citation and the layout of the references are incorrect and don't match the author's guidelines.	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No. Lots of grammatical mistakes and typo errors are present in the manuscript. So, I suggest to rewrite the manuscript by following the provided guidelines.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Abstract: It is incomplete. Rewrite</p> <p>Introduction: Rewrite the 2nd para. It is not very informative. No division of sections and subsections in the main text of the manuscript as stated in the guidelines.</p> <p>Materials and Method: the methodology is not completely explained. The title states that the native Bt strains are BACILLUS THURINGIENSIS BERLINER but in the methodology, authors have not stated how the native strains were identified as Btvar berliner from where they were collected. How many strains were used for bioassay etc?</p> <p>Result and Discussion:The distribution of mortality for the 16 soil, 7 ware houses and 3 insect cadaver of <i>B.t</i> strains were separated into 20 groups ranging from 0-4 to 95-100% mortality according to the method described by Meadows <i>et al.</i> (1992). What does it means? (Plate 1a and 1b) where are the plate.</p> <p>Conclusion: No conclusion is provided.</p> <p>References: Incorrected layout and incorrect citation.</p>	

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:	Ganga Gharty Chhetri
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal