

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_109414
Title of the Manuscript:	Divergent survival costs in homosexual and heterosexual interactions among coffee white stem borers, <i>Xylotrechus quadripes</i> (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>1. This MS provides preliminary information about the survival rate of coffee borer cerambycid beetle individuals in different conditions. Therefore, it would be helpful for the researchers in the field.</p> <p>2. I do not think so. My title suggestion is "Life span changes of coffee white stem borers, <i>Xylotrechus quadripes</i> (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae) in response to directed homosexual and heterosexual interactions"</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract section is comprehensive. However, I recommended many minor corrections to present a clear understanding (please check the changes tracked MS file).</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are mostly appropriate. Aim of the study should be added to the end of the introduction section.</p> <p>5. Statistical analyses are not satisfying but not wrong. It just has to be stated clearly.</p> <p>6. The references are not recent but essential, and compatible with the concept of the study. Because the author needs urgent action, I will not recommend new references. It is better to keep old references instead of adding unread references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language/English quality of the article is reasonable. I added several minor revisions to the MS text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Havva Kübra Soydaş Ayoub
Department, University & Country	Kocaeli University, Türkiye