

Review form 1.7

Journal name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript number:	Ms_ IJECC _104194
Manuscript title:	"Comparative efficacy of selected chemicals and neem oil against okra shoot and fruit borer [<i>Earias vittella</i> (Fabricius)] on okra".
Item Type	

General guideline for the peer review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected solely on the basis of "lack of novelty", as long as the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. For the complete guide to the peer review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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

[Review form 1.7](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	reviewer comment	Author comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors are required to write their comments here)
<p>Mandatory REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article complete?</p> <p>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers can provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript presents: It is suggested to use the keywords section, the UNESCO THESAURUS, which is a universal glossary that allows the study to be located within a specific spectrum of sciences: Agriculture – Chemical Engineering – Okra...</p> <p>The problem is clearly identified and the investigation is adequately justified.</p> <p>The context of the investigation is detailed correctly. The randomized block experimental design is pertinent; the selected population is ideal and the formula for reading the results is propitious.</p> <p>The use of the System of Units allows a clear reading of the results. These are compared with that of other authors, revealing his contribution to the treatise on this crop.</p> <p>It would be important to determine the lines of research that can be generated from this study.</p> <p>There are no research conclusions.</p> <p>2. Subject is suitable, suggested: Comparison of selected chemicals and neem oil against okra bud and fruit borer [Earias vittella (Fabricius)] on okra</p> <p>3. It is important to mention the objective of the research. The methodology is appropriate as are the results. It is necessary to include the conclusions.</p> <p>4. The structure of the writing is incomplete.</p> <p>5. Partially, the objective and the conclusions are important elements in an investigation.</p> <p>6. The references are up to date. If it is expanded to about 30 -40 they would give greater strength to the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article contains significant elements to be considered in the cultivation system of this product (okra). However, there are structural limitations and other elements that must be taken into account. It must be corrected to see its possible publication.</p> <p>Appropriate</p>	
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador