

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_103244</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative efficacy and economics of selected chemicals and neem oil against gram pod borer [<i>Helicoverpaarmigera</i> (Hubner)] on cowpea [<i>Vignaunguiculata</i> (L.) Walp.]</b>
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The work analyzes the efficacy and economy of selected chemicals and neem oil against sheath borer [ <i>Helicoverpaarmigera</i> (Hubner)] on cowpea [ <i>Vignaunguiculata</i> (L.) Walp.].  2. The title expresses the situation under study.  3. It is necessary to mention the objective of the investigation.  4. The work has an adequate structure.  5. It is recommended to discuss the results in the context of the experimental design.  6. The references are adjusted to the context of the investigation.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	yes, acceptable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	specify the treatment with greater efficiency	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Manuel Emilio Milla Pino</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University of Jaen, Peru</b>