

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_106253
Title of the Manuscript:	Seasonal incidence and population dynamics of red pumpkin beetle, (<i>Aulacophora foveicollis</i>) on bottle gourd (<i>Lagenaria siceraria</i> M.) and their Correlation with abiotic factors
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It could be a lot more useful if the author gives more information about the pests, what damage they cause to the crop, their importance as pests, and if more insect species were sampled, they should be included in this manuscript. Needs to incorporate weather data, ideally in a graph with the incidence of the pests through time.</p> <p>I would include fruit fly and its scientific name in the title, as well, because its incidence is also included. I would not write Correlation with capital letter. Also give information of the region and country where the study was conducted (don't take anything for granted).</p> <p>It is poorly written, not clear, uses abbreviations that are not previously described. Uses long sentences and you get lost. Needs a lot of work.</p> <p>They are but the manuscript as such is difficult to follow. I would include a graphic with either bars or lines to show incidence of the two organisms listed through time.</p> <p>I wouldn't say is incorrect, but is unclear, poorly written and needs quite some work to improve its usefulness and clarity.</p> <p>Since not much is discussed about the insect species presented, I think the number of references is enough. I do see some errors in the listing of references.</p> <p>There is absolutely no information about the weather conditions of the study period, which I think is a must. There is no clear explanation, understandable to every reader, about the results. E.g. what does a negative correlation between the beetle and relative humidity mean? It should be explained in simple words.</p>	<p>Let me know if you want me to go ahead and correct what I think would make this article valuable and clear.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>No, it needs several corrections.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I think this information could be very valuable if presented in a practical way, linking the importance of the two pests studied to weather conditions.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Lorena Lastres Schindler
Department, University & Country	Honduras