

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJECC _107173
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFICACY OF INTERCROPPING, BOTANICALS AND INSECTICIDES AGAINST OKRA SHOOT AND FRUIT BORER (EARIAS VITTELLA) ON OKRA IN UTTAR PRADESH
Type of the 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The subject of this manuscript is important for scientific community. The manuscript is comparing biological and chemical methods of controlling okra shoot and fruit borer. It would be interesting to find out whether biological methods would offer adequate control of the borer. This would go a long way toward reducing environmental pollution by agrochemicals. The title needs a bit of improvement as I have indicated on the manuscript. The abstract has not outlined the problem and justification for the study. The subsections and structure are appropriate, apart from the suggested correction in my comment on the manuscript. The manuscript is not scientifically correct. The Materials & Methods section does not show how the data was analysed, thus there is no basis for declaration of significance or non-significance when comparing treatment means. The Results and Discussion section focuses on data trends and ranges, giving an indication that the data was not subjected to statistical analysis. The discussion part of this section is inadequate. Only two (2) of the references listed under the Reference section have been cited in the text, while most citations in the text are not listed (refer to the comments on the manuscript). <p>There is no adequate flow of information within the manuscript. Some sentences are poorly constructed, making it difficult for the reader to get the message being conveyed in the statement.</p> <p>The Conclusion section is inadequate. It is poorly constructed, making it difficult to pick out any recommendation(s) from the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The manuscript shows inadequate mastery of the English language, making the quality of the article rather unsuitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<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:	Hemedi Mkuzi Saha
Department, University & Country	Pwani University, Kenya