

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104386
Title of the Manuscript:	Traditionally used Botanicals: The potential source of Tribolium castaneum (Herbst) management
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are 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 suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. The research on the use of botanicals in pest management is a good sound but their usage in the farming community is rare. The research experiment and methodology is good and requires more experiment to finalize the botanicals usage in the future.</p> <p>Good, but improvement in the title is needed</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No, kindly follow the author's guidelines and rewrite it accordingly</p> <p>Improvement required</p> <p>Yes, no need for additional references</p> <p>The author should go through the manuscript and rewrite it accordingly as per author guidelines.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Should improve the language and grammars mistake.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>You can add the following references (if needed)</p> <p>Awad R, Levac D, Cybulska P, Merali Z, Trudeau VL, Arnason JT. Effects of traditionally used anxiolytic botanicals on enzymes of the γ-aminobutyric acid (GABA) system. Canadian journal of physiology and pharmacology. 2007 Sep;85(9):933-42.</p> <p>Schachter SC. Botanicals and herbs: a traditional approach to treating epilepsy. Neurotherapeutics. 2009 Apr 1;6(2):415-20.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Praveen T
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India