**Reviewer comments**

1. **Comment on the Language and Grammar, Also indicate whether language editing required? 1
Tthe language and grammar were appropriate. Language editing is not required.**
2. **General comment on the technical content of the Manuscript. 1
The content of the manuscript was relevant. Fall armyworm being major pest, and recommendations of fungal pathogens are on the anvil, a study pertaining to its compatibility with recommended insecticides will have a greater utility for the stakeholders.**
3. **Clarity of the title reflection the content and findings of the manuscript. 1**

**The title of the paper reflects the content of the manuscript and its findings adequately.**

1. **Whether the component of the abstract is cleared summarized? 1
Yes. The abstact is a clear summary of the findings.**
2. **Comment on the importance, appropriateness and purpose in the introduction. 1**

**The introduction part was crisp, to the point and well written.**

1. **How well Materials and methods are detailed.
Please specify whether the objective are clearly focused, choice of experimental methods,
statistical design, and analytical methods followed,
and qualify graphs, tables and figures.**

**The M&M is clearly presented. The methods are accurate, the statistical design appropriate. Graphs and tables were judiciously used.**

1. **Whether the results are presented appropriately?**

**Yes. The results are presented in an appropriate manner.**

1. **How well the data analyzed and presented? 1**

**The data were neatly analysed with AGRES along with necessary transformations.**

1. **Comment on the hypotheses or research questions addressed along with supporting data.**

**The supporting data well calrifies the hypothesis.**

1. **Overall Scorings of the Manuscript**

**VERY GOOD.**

**11) Recommendation:
~~a. Recommend as such~~b. Recommend minor corrections – One or two references are to be added substantiating an important outcome of the study.
~~c. Recommend major corrections
d. Not recommended~~**