

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99136
Title of the Manuscript:	"Comparative Analysis of the Effect of Different Insecticide Treatments on Nagpur Mandarin in Biomass Accumulation"
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>)

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 manuscript, if it is important to the scientific community; Because it is the beginning of an investigation, there is still a need to investigate the effects of insecticides on plants, especially fruits. 2. The title of the article is appropriate; because it expresses everything that has been developed in the manuscript. 3. The summary is incomplete, because it has an introduction, objective, methodology, results; but it is missing conclusion. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript, if they are appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, but the F test needs to be explained. 6. The references are sufficient, but it has references that are anonymous, in addition to having almost 37% of the references older than the year 1995; Lastly, it has a reference that I did not find in the aforementioned journal (Bouziane, H., Lahrouni, M., & Bouharroud, R. (2021). Effect of some insecticides on growth and yield of citrus fruits. Journal of Plant Protection Research, 61(3), 293-299.).	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The English language used in this manuscript is of good quality.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mario Omar Calla Salcedo
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Amapá, Brazil