

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.	This manuscript is important as Author has discussed management of Diamond back moth, <i>Plutella xylostella</i>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>There are few shortcomings in the manuscript. For details please see the comments in reviewed manuscript. The observed shortcomings are followings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. B.t should be B.t. throughout the manuscript, for details see the reviewed manuscript 2. There should be not full sop after h unit of time for details see the reviewed manuscript. 3. Author must re-write few sentences which sre highlighted in manuscript as sentences are incomplete or not understandable. 4. Author must check for comma and full stop in "et al". write "et al." 5. Also check for "°C" (Degree Celsius) 6. S.No. 7 is missing in Table No. 1 7. Malathi and Damodaran (1999) reference is not cited in text correctly 8. What is Plate 1a and 1b?? 9. In tables "control" should be written as "Control". For details see the reviewed manuscript 10. In reference section, references are not on same pattern as in many reference year is within the bracket while in many references year is not within the bracket. Example 2007 or (2007). 11. Few references are not arranged alphabetically. 12. One reference is incomplete. 13. One reference is not cited in text. 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakesh Kumar
Department, University & Country	Maharishi Markandeshwar (DU), India