

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105337
Title of the Manuscript:	A comprehensive review on Seasonal incidence of Fall army worm, Spodoptera frugiperda (J.E. Smith) and their management
Type of the Article	Review 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>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. The review is written eloquently but needs more scientific detailing. More effort needs to be put in to add scientific details in certain aspects</p> <p>2. Though the title says, it is a comprehensive review. It is not.</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. The scientific merit may be enhanced by adding specific scientific details rather than superficial statements.</p> <p>7. Yes, But the details of references are not given in the specific format. For example, the journal titles are abbreviated in one but expanded in the other. If more authors are there, their names are not mentioned.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is highly recommended to have the paper grammar-checked and undergo stylistics and editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Follow the journal guidance.</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:	V. Selvanarayanan
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India