

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102492
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of different plant extracts and insecticide on Red flour beetle, Tribolium castaneum(Herbst) in Wheat, Triticum aestivum
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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1 – The subject of the article is relevant, since it seeks more "green" alternatives to promote the control of agricultural pests.</p> <p>2 – The title is suitable.</p> <p>3 – The abstract does not indicate whether the study involved positive and negative control. It also doesn't cite how many (and what) plant species were tested. It is not clear whether what was tested: the extracts or the powder from the plant species. The methodology was not described.</p> <p>4 – The manuscript has the appropriated sections but, they aren't completed (in item 5 I explain).</p> <p>5- I believe the work leaves many gaps that are needed in a scientific study:</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: It would be good inform about the vegetable species tested. Wich secondary metabolite classes the chosen plants have? Are there studies about the repellence of this plants?</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS – *No data are provided on the location and conditions of collection of plant species. This is important because plant species may present variations in their metabolism according to the genetic variants, conditions of cultivation, collection, and storage. *There is no citation of the plant species that were tested. *There are no indications if false positive (control) tests were performed. *The secondary metabolites present in each vegetable specimen should have been determined.</p> <p>RESULTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The observed results are not discussed based on the literature, lacking a theoretical foundation. <p>CONCLUSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are several plant species that have toxic effects on man. We cannot say, in general, that plants guarantee "safety" if used in place of insecticides. • <p>6 – There are only nine references, of which only two are from the last five years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There are some language mistakes but, in general, the english quality is suitable for scholarly communications.</p> <p>I made some yellow marks in manuscript text to indicate some minor mistakes.</p> <p>castaneum(Herbst) – castaneum (Herbst)</p> <p>Department of Entomology 2022 – The number 2022 was the year of the experiment?</p> <p>botanicals the more number of mortality - the largest number of</p> <p>loss is occurred / is observed – was</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	be incorporated for the management – incorporated to the odour- odor	
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:	Esther Maria Ferreira Lucas
Department, University & Country	Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica de Minas Gerais, Brazil