



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3595
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of selected biopesticides with Chlorantraniliprole against gram Pod borer, <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (Hubner) on chickpea
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘lack of Novelty’, provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the</p>	<p>It is of value as applied research towards betterment of Agricultural Science</p> <p>Title is appropriate</p> <p>Abstract reflect the purpose of the research, methods used, important findings and their significance.</p> <p>Research Technique and Methodology are appropriate, relating to research work. Data collected were adequate to draw valid conclusions. Results were properly analysed and interpreted</p> <p>Manuscript is scientifically correct (Corrections for typographical errors are suggested)</p>	<p>Revision made</p>



<p>manuscript is scientifically correct?</p>	References are sufficient and addition of recent references will strengthen the manuscript	Corrected all
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.		
	Major changes required	
	1. Data on larval population (mean No. /plant) (Table 1) needs transformation for statistical analysis.	
	2. Re check the SE and CD values.	
<u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	3. As the study is carried out in 2023-24, literature cited is quiet older. Recent reference is 2020. Cite some more recent references	

Minor REVISION comments	Suggestion of corrections on the following points		
	Sr. No.	Written as	Suggested correction
		Abstract	
	1	Chlorantraniliprole18.5 S (Line No. 06)	Chlorantraniliprole18.5 SC
	2	<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> @2.5 gm/lit, <i>Beauveria bassiana</i> @2.5gm/lit	<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> 1x10 ⁹ CFU/ml @2.5gm/lit., <i>Beauveria bassiana</i> 1x10 ⁸ CFU/ml @2.5gm/lit
	3	mean population of pod borer population <i>i.e.</i> (1.79) which was significantly superior over control followed by Spinosad 45 % SC (2.02%), Emamectin benzoate 5%SG (2.23%), Neem oil 2% (2.41%), NSKE 5% SC (2.61%), <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> (1.83%) and <i>Beauveria bassiana</i> (2.99%)	mean population of pod borer population <i>i.e.</i> (1.79) which was significantly superior over control followed by Spinosad 45 % SC (2.02), Emamectin benzoate 5%SG (2.23), Neem oil 2% (2.41), NSKE 5% SC (2.61), <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> (1.83) and <i>Beauveria bassiana</i> (2.99)
	4	followed by Spinosad 45 % SC %SC 26.7 q/h	followed by Spinosad 45 % SC 26.7 q/ha
	5	q/h	q/ha
		Results	
	6	Table 1: Larval population	Larval population (No./Plant)
	7	The data larval population of <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> over control after two sprays revealed that (Table 1) all the treatments were significantly superior over control	The data on larval population of <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (No./Plant) after two sprays (Table 1) revealed that all the treatments were significantly superior over control.
	8	<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> (17.0q/ha), and T5 <i>Beauveria bassiana</i> (11.7q/ha)	<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> 1x10 ⁹ CFU/ml @2.5gm/lit (17.0q/ha), and <i>Beauveria bassiana</i> 1x10 ⁸

		CFU/ml @2.5gm/lit (11.7q/ha)	
9	interesting results was achieved	interesting results were achieved	
	Discussion		
10	All the treatments were found to be significantly	All the treatments were found significantly	
11	The results were similar to be findings reported by	The results were similar to the findings reported by	
12	Sushma <i>et al.</i> (2016)	Sushma and Bharpoda (2016)	
13	Spinosad 45% SC was found to be next best treatment. The results of Spinosad (2.02) were supported by	Spinosad 45% SC was found the next best treatment (2.02 larvae/ plant). These results were supported by	
14	Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (2.23) found to be next best effective treatment. These results were similar finding of Khademul <i>et al.</i> (2020), Kumar and Sarada (2015).	Followed by the treatment with Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (2.23 larvae/ plant). These results were similar with the findings of Khademul <i>et al.</i> (2020), Kumar and Sarada (2015).	
15	Among all the treatments the higher yield (28.3q/ha) and higher cost benefit ratio was obtained from Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC	Among all the treatments the higher yield (28.3q/ha) and higher cost benefit ratio (1:3.1) was obtained with Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC	
16	The present findings conclude that the new generation insecticides Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 Sc were	The present finding conclude that the new generation insecticide Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC was	
	Literature Cited		
17	Sushma, D. and Bharpoda (2016)	Sushma, D. and Bharpoda, (2016)	



	18	Deshmukh, S.G., Sureja, B.V., Jethva, D.M. and Chatar, V.P. (2010)	Cite or delete the reference	
	19	Ghosal, A., Chatterjee, M. L. and Manna, D. (2012)	Cite or delete the reference	
	20	Jat, S.K. and Ameta O.P. (2013)	Cite or delete the reference	
	21	Ojha, P.K., Kumari, R. and Chaudhary R.S. (2017)	Cite or delete the reference	
Optional 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>	