

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_103415 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | “Comparative efficacy of different microbial biopesticides against gram pod borer, <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (Hubner) on chickpea, <i>Cicer arietinum</i> (L.)” |
| 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) |
|---|---|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> | References to yield, production etc can be updated. Emamectin benzonate is considered as CfS by EU (very low ADI value). Why you consider it as a biopesticide? Only yield seems to be significant different among treatments. The differences reported in larval population seem no significant from efficacy point of view (pretty low differences, even compared with control). May the sampling was too small. No mention was done to the differences among first and second treatment, and if they are significant form efficacy point of view. Results can be used to recommended treatments for farmers accordingly. Results compared with the fenology and biology of the pest should be included in the manuscript to made recommendations in real conditions. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | ok | |
| 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> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Name: | Marta Giner |
| Department, University & Country | Spain |