

Review Form 1.7

Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101040
Title of the Manuscript:	Cost Effective Analysis of Fall Armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) on Maize at Allahabad
Type of the Article	Original

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)
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community because this explain with new methods the sensory, biochemical and microbiologic characteristic.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is not comprehensive.</p> <p>The subsection and structure of the article answer to requirements.</p> <p>I think the scientifically research resulted as a study by speciality literature.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript are sufficient references, but they are not explicated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Neither the yield and the cost-benefit ratio was calculated in the work. The values mentioned in the results and conclusion refer to the Bibliography at no. 7, 8, 9, 10. These values can be found in table 1. But how did they result?</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Radu V. Steluța
Department, University & Country	"Ion Ionescu de la Brad" University Life of Science, Romania