

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_120718
Title of the Manuscript:	Seasonal Activities of thrips (Thrips tabaci L.) in onion and their Relation with the Various Environmental Factors
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>1-please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. why like (or dislike) this manuscript? minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> <p>a) the manuscript is interesting and of importance to the world where cebolla's production and consumption is large.</p> <p>b)- i did not like the manuscript presented that in the authors without any guidance simply simply the scientific names of the species in study, causing errors in the manuscript, which should be eliminated. ex. (Thrips tabaci L.) here this species was placed with a mistakes of the discovering and identifier of this species, which according to the scientific name placed would be by Carlos Linneus, who uses the letter (L) as abbreviation to catalog their scientific discoveries. in reality the author of this discover and (Karl Eduard Lindemann ") who uses the name - Lindemann, to identify his discoveries, so the name runs (thrips tabaci Lidermann)</p> <p>C)- The manuscript has multiples formatting errors and on everything in order to put the references in the text, where the authors do not follow a logical order by the number of appearance in the text,</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>2- Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>R/ The title is suitable. There are other articles already published on this topic so important</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>3- Is the summary of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or exclusion) from some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p> <p>R/ The summary follows the guidelines of the Journal, indicating all the necessary items for a good summary. A suggestion for the authors and put the scientific name of the species under study, as the authors speak a lot about the popular name. There are times when the scientific name cannot be forgotten. (Title, summary, keys, methodology, conclusions, etc.)</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 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>4- Are subsections and the structure of the manuscript appropriate? Please write some phrases about the scientific correction of this manuscript. Why think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically solid? Minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> <p>R/ the authors did not use the Journal's guidelines for the elaboration of the manuscript and therefore commented multiples errors. They did not subdivision by sub-sections, did not put the references in proper order, secure guidance, both in the text and in the final list.</p> <p>I do not consider it to be a robust manuscript or solid technicalMenye. The authors used put words for this type of original article. (3000-5000 words). Many abbreviations without explanation when they are first used. ETC.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>5- Are references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, mention in the review form.</p> <p>R/ the references in the joint were 13 references, In the manuscript the authors did not use the guidelines of the Journal and did everything wrong with the references. Everything that could not be done was done, and everything wrong. These errors must correct and place the references according to the Journal guidelines. From 13 references 10 went from 2003 to 2019. For a medium from 2013, 11 years delayed. Alem has 3 reference from 1968 until 1994, to a medium from 1982. The references are very late.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	MINOR REVIEW COMMENTS Is the quality of the article/English in the article suitable for academic communications? R/here the English language could have all the quality possible, plus the errors in the chapter were large that we could leave for a new version of this chapter. I consider it good quality and that allows communication with the World Academic.	
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:	Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez
Department, University & Country	Havana University, Cuba