



Name:	<a href="#"><u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u></a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_UPJOZ_3317</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bionomics and damage estimation of a phlaeothripid <i>Dolichothrips indicus</i> (Hood) in a new host in Tamil Nadu, India</b>
Type of the Article	



## 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b>  (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b>  (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in</b>	<p><b>Yes, because it concerns the taxonomic identification of an insect that is becoming a pest of an important crop in the country of India.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, because it efficiently describes what was done in the research work.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, because it succinctly describes all the topics of the scientific paper.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, they are.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, in my opinion all the methodologies used in this research project are scientifically correct and well referenced by citing other scientific papers.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, they are.</b></p>	<p>The paper's review procedure is thorough and succinct. The reviewer's timely reaction and excellent recommendations are also appreciated.</p>



the review form.  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The paper was well written, organized and provides a fluid reading through its subsections. The materials and methods used were appropriate for what was proposed in the objective of the article and the data analysis was correct. The results are well presented and the discussions are sufficiently detailed. The conclusion responds to the objective of the paper and is correctly supported by the results.	
<b>Optional</b> comments		

## **PART 2:**

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