

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_100932</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact of pesticides on beneficial insects in various agroecosystem</b>
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, is important to know the topic regarding pesticides and its impact in the insects and the agroecosystems and this manuscript provide a systematic information on this regard highlighting the effect (beneficial or deleterious) of pesticides on the ecosystems.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is clear</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes, assuming it is a review manuscript</p> <p>5. Partially, if well there is enough reviewed information is not clear the contribution of the authors to the discussion of different aspects indicated in the subtitles. Also is absent the purpose of the revision in the main text although is present in the abstract</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Additional detailed suggestions were included in the manuscript</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Miguel Guzman-Rivero</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Centro Universitario de Medicina Tropical, Instituto de Investigaciones Biomédicas, Universidad Mayor de San Simón, Bolivia</b>