

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95593
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of cold storage of trichocard on adult emergence and parasitization of Trichogramma chilonis
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)
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)	1. Yes, the article is important to the scientific community because: 1.1 presents a biological combating solution that can replace the polluting and dangerous chemical solution; 1.2 presents a solution of theoretical and practical handling of the biological rhythm of the species used against the parasites, using as operating parameters temperature and storage time; 1.3 presents a challenge for modelling the biological action of wasps against pests; 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article comprehensive. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The article can be improved by: 5.1 English control with the text editor or alternative programs (eg Grammarly Free or Higher version); 5.2 Improvement of scientific language and expression; 5.3 There are two potentially explained abbreviations. 6. The references are sufficient and recent, but: 6.1 I did not find the citation in the text of the manuscript of two works.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, see 5.1, 5.2.	
Optional/General comments	Some suggestions are given to the reviewer authors at the end of the reviewed manuscript.	

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:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Research, Romania