

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Current Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCR_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	

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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Manuscript has given the importance of returning to nature and international trends to keep away from the use of harmful synthetic pesticides.• Hence the importance of using biological control, represented by the use of bacteria (BT) that cause diseases for insects, to confirm that.• But there were a lot of details in the introduction describing the bacteria and its mode of action with old reference (that information well known for whome work with biological control with a lot of reffereces not need here).• It was better to put references about BT as a biocontrol agent with other plants.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The title is suitable	

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract sort of comprehensive only need When abbreviating bt, it needs to be written in capital letters, not italics and abbreviated. • Need to add the aim of this work clearly at the end. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes in general with restriction to use cloropyrofose and same products as it became prohibited to use internationally cause it cause damage to clildrens prain in specific way. • Must declear the isolated isolations from different soils in material and methods and declear each in results. • The small letters at table 2 should declear uder the table. • Also Fig. 1 not clear need more explanation on it. • No need to mention review literature in result and discution only discuse the result ad if need refere to another auther's result just to cofirm yours. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not recent enough there were some soo old like (Baskaran, P., & Sekar, P. (1976). Compatibility studies on Dipel (Bacillus thuringiensis Berliner) with certain synthetic insecticides) and not comlete cited. • Navya, R.N.S., Balasubramani, V., Raveendran, M. et al. Characterization of indigenou Bacillus thuringiensis isolate RM11 toxic to the diamondback moth, Plutella xylostella (L.) (Lepidoptera: Plutellidae). Egypt J Biol Pest Control 32, 56 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41938-022-00553-3. • Kumar, P., Kamle, M., Borah, R. et al. Bacillus thuringiensis as microbial biopesticide: uses and application for sustainable agriculture. Egypt J Biol Pest Control 31, 95 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41938-021-00440-3. • Some references ot write l good way like (Malathi et al. (1999) its (Malathi ad Damodaran). • Other refereces not mentioned at manuscript like (Vyas, R. V., Patel, N. S., & Patel, D. J. (1999). Mass production technology for entomopathogenic nematodes, Steinernema spp. Indian Journal of Nematology, 29(2), 178) 	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's good but need some few correction. • Like (per cent) = percent 	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Hala Fouad-Ewies
Department, University & Country	Plant Protection Research Institute, Egypt