

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_112489
Title of the Manuscript:	Biology of Fall Armyworm Spodoptera frugiperda (J.E. Smith) on Maize under laboratory conditions
Type of the 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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript titled "Biology of Fall Armyworm <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> (J.E. Smith) on Maize under laboratory conditions" is important for the scientific community, especially for entomologists, agronomists, and researchers in the field of agriculture. The study contributes valuable information to the understanding of the life cycle of Fall Armyworm on maize, which can be utilized for effective pest control strategies. The inclusion of morphometric data, such as larval body length, pupal length, and adult body length, adds detail to the study and can be valuable for future research and control efforts.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract of the article provides a good overview of the study but lacks some specific details that could enhance its comprehensiveness. Here are some points to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract would benefit from precise language and terms. For example, the statement "The female was long lived than male" could be clarified by specifying the average lifespan of females and males. • Providing standard deviations for the average fecundity and pupal duration is good practice, but it might be helpful to briefly explain the significance or implications of these values. • While the growth periods for each larval instar are mentioned, additional information on the observed behaviors or characteristics during these stages could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the species' development. <p>The manuscript is well-written and well-organized. The subsections are clear and concise, and the structure of the manuscript follows a standard scientific paper format.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It follows a standard scientific paper format, the results are presented clearly and objectively, and the conclusions are supported by the data. The comparison with literature data on the life cycle of Fall Armyworm provides context and supports the findings.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but the author has to correct small mistakes in the manuscript. For example, correct the grammatical errors in the abstract, such as "rick" instead of "rich" and "attacked" instead of "attacks."</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Iosob Gabriel-Alin
Department, University & Country	Vegetable Research and Development Station, Romania