

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103575
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of selected insecticides with Botanicals and Bio-agents against Diamondback moth, <i>Plutella xylostella</i> (L.) in cabbage, <i>Brassica oleracea</i> var <i>capitata</i> (L.)
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> <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. This manuscript showed that T1 Chlorantraniliprole 18.5%SC recorded best and proved best effective for Diamondback moth. The result looks interesting.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>It is basically good. However, the abstract is wordy. Please refine the contents and present readers with a concise abstract.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Except for the questions mentioned above, I have the following comments: (1) For the current basic computing and calculated results, it is suggested to adopt statistical analysis to get the p-values to check the significance. (2) The style writing of mathematical formulas is irregular. For example, the formulas on page 5 and page 6, their font size is obviously different. (3) On page 10, line 1, "Conclusion" should use capitals to keep consistency with other section titles. (4) In References, on page 11, repeated references: ref.7 and ref.8.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>This manuscript should benefit from language editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Xinxing Wu
Department, University & Country	Midway University, United States