

**Review form 1.7**

Journal name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_96150</b>
Manuscript title:	<b>Evaluation of IPM modules against fall armyworm in maize through first-line demonstration and its economic impact</b>
Item Type	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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://www.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><b>Mandatory</b> REVIEW Feedback</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community?</b> (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article appropriate?</b> (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article complete?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers can provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript becomes important when presenting aadequate background for the investigation; The problem raised in relation to traditional cultivation and its deficiencies are clear, as well as the proposal to use new state-of-the-art technologies that not only help the farmer in its efficiency and performance, but also that the product takes an important quality turn. The writing presents a significant contribution to the area and the Market that is in charge of planting and distributing this product. In addition, the study is adequately and academically justified. The context shows that it is suitable for experimentation, in this case, it was experimental - controlled. The formulas used to determine the results are optimal. The results show the important economic contribution that is given to this product with the use of new technologies. Therefore, this is important for the development of the area. In conclusion, it is important to investigate what would be the new ways to educate the farmer; this is a challenge for future complementary research. This process reveals an effort of this research that contributes, as has been said, to the academy, enriching it with new proposals.</p> <p>2. The topic raised seems to be a target. Evaluation of IPM modules against the fall armyworm in maize. Demonstration of first line and its economic impact (suggestion for the title).</p> <p>3. It should be written in a single paragraph with the elements found in this manuscript.</p> <p>4. Regarding its structure, it complies with the norm and form of an academic article that is intended to be published.</p> <p>5. As mentioned above, the writing meets the academic requirements, so its level of similarity is low.</p> <p>6. The references support an investigation, in this case being an original investigation, it can be understood that there is not much specialized bibliography on the subject raised. From this perspective it is acceptable. However, if it is possible to inquire into other world contexts on the subject, it could be enriched so as not to remain in a locality or comfort zone. This is because the product is treated on different continents in different ways. In this case, there could be more references that strengthen the writing.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVIEW Feedback</p> <p><b>1. Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate forscholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The text is adequate in the language raised.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador</b>