

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102543
Title of the Manuscript:	Cost Effective of Gram pod borer Helicoverpa armigera (Hubner) on green gram at Allahabad
Type of the Article	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://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>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. It revealed a comparative cost effectiveness of different insecticidal applications to check the gram pod porer on green gram at Allahabad.</p> <p>The title should be adjusted to suit the entire research work: "Comparative insecticidal applications to check gram pod borer on green gram at Allahabad"</p> <p>Yes, the article captured the necessary details</p> <p>The subsections and structures are appropriate</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript has the statistical explanation and hence is scientifically correct</p> <p>References are not sufficient, more references needed,3 or more relevant references should be added</p> <p>It is proper to specify the RELEVANCE and OBJECTIVES of research, second to the last paragraph and the last paragraphs respectively.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the English is moderately suitable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research is properly articulated but Anonymus, 2015 was not included among the references and Meena et al. (2021) conflicts in the use of year in the reference section i.e. (2022).</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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chika Wahua
Department, University & Country	University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria