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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **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.** | The paper presents scientifically sound research with original data comparing the different stages of white fly which is a major pest of sugarcane. The laboratory study is appropriate, and statistical analyses are correctly applied. The research addresses a practically important problem – sugarcane white flySugarcane cultivation. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Instead of morphometry can use morphometric studies. Otherwise, title is clear, understanding and scientifically sound. |  |
| 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. | Abstract is scientifically sound but not yet effective as more repetition of values. With a few revisions (summarization, stronger intro/conclusion, and less repetition), it can easily become strong enough for journal submission.Abstract original opening is abrupt. Instead, briefly highlight the significance of the pest and the reason for studying its biology.In abstract too many fragmented numerical, instead summarize numerical values and emphasis only biologically important values because it can overwhelm the reader and reduce readability.Instead of egg period use egg incubation period.Can add final sentence on the significance or application of the findings. |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The research is valuable and addresses an important agricultural problem. The experimental design is sound and results are significant. However, the manuscript requires substantial revision to meet publication standards, particularly in terms of language editing, formatting consistency, and enhanced discussion of the broader implications of the findings. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | More recent reference can be added after 2020; it will affect the work more scientifically.  |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The paper has significant grammatical and structural component. While the content is basically understandable. |  |
| Optional/General comments | Write full abbreviation of Anon., 2013In introduction part long pest list May summaries as “Key pests include lepidopterans (borers) and coleopterans; stem borers, hemipterans are the most destructive.The paper lacks sufficient discussion on whitefly morphometric study and Limited discussion on environmental implications of the whitefly In manuscript during discussion author cite repeated work, can cite different researcher work.In my thoughts conclusion can be descriptive, it is like only repetition of data.Lack of proper discussion in manuscript.Accept with Minor Revisions to content. |  |
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