

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104492
Title of the Manuscript:	Seasonal incidence of insect pests of tomato (<i>Lycopersicum esculentum</i> Miller)
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 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)
<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>This manuscript is not much important to the scientific community, as it includes only single season (Rabi 2022) data. It is imperative to study the correlation matrices only based on two season data to exhibit the influence of weather parameters on insect population.</p> <p>No. It is not as it includes only one season. If the article is accepted, the title may be revised citing the season in the title.</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive</p> <p>Yes, It is appropriate</p> <p>No, it is not scientifically correct. The methodology adopted needs more explanation and specific details. Statistical parameters were never considered.</p> <p>Many references are very general and may be redundant. One citation is missing in Reference section. Proper format is not followed for listing the references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Lot of corrections, queries are indicated in the manuscript as 'Track Changes' or as 'Comments' which need to perused and corrected accordingly	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	V. Selvanarayanan
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India