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

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

**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 | *Bacillus thurngiensis* @2.5 gm/lit, *Beauveria bassiana* @2.5gm/lit | *Bacillus thuringiensis* 1x$10^9$ CFU/ml @2.5gm/lit., *Beauveria bassiana* 1x$10^8$ CFU/ml @2.5gm/lit |
| 3 | mean population of pod borer population *i.e.* (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%), *Bacillus thurngiensis* (1.83%) and *Beauveria bassiana* (2.99%) | mean population of pod borer population *i.e.* (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), *Bacillus thurngiensis* (1.83) and *Beauveria bassiana* (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 *Helicoverpa armigera* over control after two sprays revealed that (Table 1) all the treatments were significantly superior over control | The data on larval population of *Helicoverpa armigera* (No./Plant) after two sprays (Table 1) revealed that all the treatments were significantly superior over control. |
| 8 | *Bacillus thurngiensis* (17.0q/ha), and T5 *Beauveria bassiana* (11.7q/ha) | *Bacillus thurngiensis* 1x$10^9$ CFU/ml @2.5gm/lit (17.0q/ha), and *Beauveria bassiana* 1x$10^8$ |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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 *et al*. (2016) | Sushma and Bharpoda (2016) |
| | 13 | Spinosad 45% SC was found to be next best treatment. The results ofSpinosad (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 *et al*. (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 *et al*. (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 Chlorantraniliprole18.5 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** *(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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **V. K. Biradar** |
| Department, University & Country | **Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, India** |