

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_112098
Title of the Manuscript:	Advances in the Biology, Behavior, Ecology, and Management of the Sal Heartwood Borer, <i>Hoplocerambyx spinicornis</i> Newman, 1842 (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae): A Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Author conducted a very relevant research to the related field and can potentially be a fundamental reference for the sustainability of Shorea Robusta species. However, in general, the scientific evidence is at times insufficient to support the authors' claims</p> <p>2. For the title, I think it would less confusing and less lengthy to general reader if the name and year of the researcher is excluded in the title. Thus, the title becomes: 'Advances in the Biology, Behavior, Ecology, and Management of the Sal Heartwood Borer, <i>Hoplocerambyx spinicornis</i> (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae): A Review'.</p> <p>3. Includes all points required for an abstract.</p> <p>4. The overall arrangement and the flow of information is good.</p> <p>5. The manuscript can be more promising with more resources being included, compared and analysed.</p> <p>6. The amount of information provided is insufficient for a review paper standard. I suggest adding more detail information and examples in the contents of the manuscript. Additionally, increasing the variability of references being implemented is also very recommended in order to confidently build a firm and reliable conclusion for the review paper.</p> <p>Additional comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species name (<i>H. spinicornis</i>) had not been italicized in many places in the manuscript. • All tables were presented without any mention nor brief description in the text, making it difficult to understand the contents of the tables. • No citations for the information stated in the tables. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No notable language or scientific writing problems detected.	
Optional/General comments	Overall manuscript was well-written, well-structured, concise and easy to understand but the key information and scientific evidences were inadequately addressed.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Indah Nilam Sari Yahaya
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia