

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97005
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of biopesticides and newer insecticides against major insect pests of cauliflower
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://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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The author is able to make it important for scientific community: A. read it carefully to correct the existing typos; B. rephrase the highlighted parts / sentences; C. briefly response to the comments. 2. The title is okay. 3. If possible, address the cost-benefit for 'Indoxacarb 45 SC' in abstract. 4. Probably, the subtitles for 'Conclusion' and 'References' are expected to be cantered, so that to be consistent with other subtitles. 5. It should be correct; but some details are expected to be briefly addressed (please see the comments). 6. Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Overall, the language is expected to be polished.	
Optional/General comments	('Materials and Methods' section): using a table to address the 'treatments' (T1 – T10) is probably better.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mingzeng Sun
Department, University & Country	USA