

**Review Form 3**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJECC_120416</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Population dynamics of Fall armyworm Spodoptera frugiperda (J.E. Smith) and its Natural Enemies Maize in India</b> |
| Type of the Article      |   |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | Reviewer's comment   | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>                           | <p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the population dynamics of Fall armyworm (<i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>) and its natural enemies in maize crops in India. The study's importance lies in its contribution to understanding the relationship between pest infestation, natural enemy populations, and various weather parameters. This information is crucial for developing effective integrated pest management strategies in the region.</p> <p>I appreciate several aspects of this manuscript:<br/>           It offers timely and relevant data on a significant agricultural pest that has recently invaded India and poses a threat to food security.<br/>           The study correlates pest infestation and natural enemy populations with specific weather parameters, providing useful information for predicting pest outbreaks and planning control measures.<br/>           The research methodology is well-structured, with clear data collection and analysis procedures.<br/>           The findings are compared with previous studies, adding to the body of knowledge on this topic and validating the results.<br/>           However, the manuscript could be improved by including more discussion on the practical implications of these findings for farmers and pest management professionals. Additionally, exploring potential climate change impacts on these dynamics would enhance the study's long-term relevance.</p> |   |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable?<br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>   | <p>Suitable</p>  |   |
| <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>  | <p>The abstract provides a good overview of the study, but it could be more comprehensive and better structured.</p>   |   |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>   | <p>Appropriate</p>   |   |
| <p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> | <p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness and technical soundness in several ways:<br/>           The study employs a well-established methodology for pest monitoring, using weekly observations on randomly selected plants, which is a standard practice in entomological field studies. This approach ensures reliable data collection and reduces potential bias.<br/>           The use of correlation analysis to examine relationships between pest infestation, natural enemy populations, and weather parameters is statistically appropriate and widely accepted in ecological studies. The authors correctly interpret the correlation coefficients and their significance levels.<br/>           The research incorporates multiple variables (pest infestation, natural enemy populations, and various weather parameters) to provide a comprehensive understanding of the ecological dynamics, which strengthens the study's scientific robustness.<br/>           The authors present their findings clearly, distinguishing between statistically significant and non-significant correlations, which demonstrates proper scientific</p>   |   |

**Review Form 3**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>interpretation of results.<br/>                 The study's results are compared with previous research findings, showing consistency with established knowledge while also contributing new insights. This comparison validates the study's findings and places them within the broader scientific context.</p> |  |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> | Yes   |  |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>              | Yes   |  |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p>   |   |  |

**PART 2:**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                          |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Name:                            | Yilin Zhang              |
| Department, University & Country | Peking University, China |