

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_113264
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Antifeedant Effects of Andrographolide-based Formulations against <i>Lampides boeticus</i> L under Laboratory Condition
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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>REVIEW comments required</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript) R/ Yeah. TOPIC RELATED TO AGRICULTURE ON PEST CONTROL. well-structured article. 2. Is the article title appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title) R/ THE TITLE IS APPROPRIATE ACCORDING TO THE RESEARCH TOPIC. 3. Is the article summary comprehensive? R/ SUMMARY WELL STRUCTURED AND OVERALL WITH ALL THE NECESSARY ITEMS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE JIURNAL GUIDELINES. FEW SIGNS. 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? R/ MANUSCRIPT WELL DIVIDED INTO SUBSECTIONS, FEW ERRORS. MAJOR ERRORS IN THE NOMENCLATURE OF THE SPECIES USED IN THE STUDY. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? R/ THE MANUSCRIPT IS SCIENTIFICALLY CORRECT. CONTAINS ALL THE ITEMS NECESSARY FOR A SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE. FEW ERRORS. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention in the review form. R/ THE REFERENCES WERE CORRECTLY INTRODUCED IN THE TEXT AND THE TOTAL AND CORRESPOND WITH THE TOTAL LISTED AT THE END OF THE ARTICLE. SOME ERRORS IN THE REFERENCES. THERE WERE 19 REFERENCES OF THEM 60% UPDATED. <p>(In addition to the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) R/ THIS ARTICLE WAS WELL STRUCTURED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES. ALL THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES WERE COMPLETED AND THERE WERE FEW ERRORS IN ITS PREPARATION Minor REVIEW comments</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for academic communications? R/ The quality of the language/English of the article is suitable FOR SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATION 	
<p>Optional/General 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:	Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez
Department, University & Country	Havana University, Cuba