

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97565
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Agrochemicals on Soil Biota and Ways to Mitigate it: A Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

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

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	This manuscript is important for the scientific community Yes it is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some words need to be fixed (attached in the manuscript); It would better if added the conclusion of the exploration - Keyword should be 3-6 words; Choose ones New generation pesticides or pesticides; change the IPM and INM with pest management This manuscript is enough appropriate but : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It would be better if more information on the success of nano technology was added to the mitigation (point 3) - In conclusion should be rewritten with short sentences according to the purpose Yes it is The used of the updated references (the last 10 years) will be better if any There are more than 30 % un-updates references	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript is good enough and worthy to published with some improvement	

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:	Ida Nur Istina
Department, University & Country	Indonesia