

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103245
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy and economics of selected insecticides against pod borer [<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (Hubner)] on cowpea [<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.)Walp.]
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>)

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> <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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Quite useful information was generated.</p> <p>Suitable title</p> <p>Covered entire concept of article</p> <p>Manuscript was appropriately arranged</p> <p>Well planned, executed and neat presentation of data in scientific way</p> <p>Sufficiently covered</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Language is well formulated	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Author has concluded experiment as Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC is more effective in controlling population of cowpea pod borer followed by Lambda cyhalothrin 5 EC was found to be the next best treatment followed by Emamectin benzoate 5 SG, Indoxacarb 14.5 SC, Flubendiamide 480 SC, Spinosad 45 SC and Thiamethoxam 25 WG in managing <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>. Among the treatments studied, Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC gave the highest cost benefit ratio (1:3.89) and marketing yield (19.46 q/ha) followed by Lambda cyhalothrin 5 EC (1:3.67 and 17.82 q/ha), Emamectin benzoate 5 SG (1:3.41 and 16.20 q/ha), Indoxacarb 14.5 SC (1:2.95 and 14.60 q/ha), Flubendiamide 480 SC (1:2.56 and 12.45 q/ha), Spinosad 45 SC (1:2.27 and 11.40 q/ha) and Thiamethoxam 25 WG (1:2.17 and 10.24 q/ha) as such more trials are required in future to validate the findings.</p> <p>Article is recommended for publication</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:	Shyamrao Kulkarni
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences, India