

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100886
Title of the Manuscript:	Abundance of major insect pests in rice and their relation to weather parameters
Type of the Article	Short research report

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>This short review is helpful to future researchers</p> <p>Yes this is suitable to his/her results</p> <p>No, it should be comprehensive and precise to 15-18lines (It is too lengthy)</p> <p>No, must write to conclusion, acknowledgements and Research interest</p> <p>Its fit for scientific community</p> <p>It need to add some more references for supporting discussion and some references were missed according to his/her write up</p> <p>The authors again thoroughly read and correct some mistakes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It needs to minor revision</p> <p>Suitable for scholarly communicate</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Observe space between two words</p> <p>Abstract: Precise to 15-18 lines or less than 150 words</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS: 3rd line : during <i>Kharif</i>, 2021-2 (mention Kharif months)</p> <p>Occurrence formula mentions in this section; Give Methodology references</p> <p>Conclusion: conclusion must write. what you are outcome conclusions?</p> <p>Reference: Missing Anonymous, 2018; Nadaf <i>et al.</i>, 2016;</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Karri Rama Rao
Department, University & Country	Dr. V. S. Krishna Govt. Degree & PG College, Andhra University, India