

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111784
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of weather parameters on population dynamics of Bihar hairy caterpillar [<i>Spilarctia (Spilosoma) obliqua</i> Walker] in Mungbean [<i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilczek]
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript under review holds significant relevance for the scientific community. The title of the paper is apt and aligns well with the content. The organization of the paper into sections and subsections is logically done, providing a coherent structure to the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>However, there are several areas where improvements are needed. The language used in the manuscript needs to be refined as it currently exhibits poor English and typographical errors. These issues can potentially hinder the comprehension of the paper's content.</p> <p>The graphical representations used in the paper lack proper labeling, which can lead to confusion and misinterpretation of the data presented. It is recommended that the authors revise these graphs for clarity and accuracy.</p> <p>A notable omission in the paper is the lack of a T-test for the analysis of significance. The inclusion of this test is crucial for validating the results and should be incorporated in the revised version of the manuscript.</p> <p>The presentation of observations and results in the paper is not well-structured or clearly articulated. It is suggested that the authors revisit these sections to ensure that the findings are presented in a clear, concise, and systematic manner.</p> <p>Lastly, the absence of any pictorial representation of the pest and field is a significant drawback. The inclusion of relevant images can greatly enhance the understanding of the study and its context.</p> <p>In conclusion, while the paper holds potential, it requires substantial revisions to meet the standards of scientific writing. The authors are encouraged to address these issues in their revision.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Line 3- r (title), Kg/hect , 77- SHOWN is written instead of SOWN</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Dethe Vinaykamal D
Department, University & Country	Maratha Vidya Prasarak Samaj, India