

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_122416</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Use of Bio-control Agents in Mulberry Pest Management: Successful Techniques and Important Issues</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript highlights the significant role of bio-control agents in sustainable pest management for mulberry cultivation. By reducing reliance on chemical pesticides, these agents help maintain ecological balance, protect beneficial organisms, and ensure long-term pest control. The research underscores the potential of bio-control agents to enhance crop yield and quality while minimizing environmental and health risks, making it a valuable resource for advancing sustainable agricultural practices.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Here are some weak points about the abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Lack of Specificity:</b> The abstract is quite general and does not provide specific details about the bio-control agents or the pests they target. It would be more informative if it mentioned specific examples of bio-control agents and the pests they control.</li> <li>2. <b>No Mention of Methods:</b> The abstract does not describe the methods used to study the effectiveness of bio-control agents. Including a brief mention of the research methods would help readers understand how the conclusions were reached.</li> <li>3. <b>Absence of Results:</b> There are no specific results or findings presented in the abstract. Effective abstracts typically include key results to give readers a sense of the study's outcomes.</li> <li>4. <b>Overly Positive Tone:</b> The abstract focuses heavily on the benefits of bio-control agents without acknowledging potential drawbacks or limitations. A more balanced view would enhance credibility.</li> <li>5. <b>Repetitive Information:</b> Some points are repeated, such as the cost-effectiveness and safety advantages of bio-control agents. This repetition could be reduced to make the abstract more concise.</li> <li>6. <b>Lack of Quantitative Data:</b> The abstract does not provide any quantitative data or metrics to support its claims. Including data would strengthen the arguments made.</li> <li>7. <b>Ambiguous Statements:</b> Phrases like "may more or less cost effective" are vague and do not provide clear information. More precise language would improve clarity.</li> <li>8. <b>No Clear Conclusion:</b> The abstract does not end with a clear conclusion or summary of the main findings. A strong concluding statement would help reinforce the key points.</li> </ol>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>yes</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript on bio-control agents in mulberry pest management appears scientifically sound. It highlights the benefits of bio-control agents, such as environmental sustainability, cost-effectiveness, and safety compared to chemical pesticides. The detailed categorization of bio-control agents into predators, parasitoids, and pathogens, along with their specific roles and examples, demonstrates a thorough understanding of the subject. Additionally, the manuscript addresses the challenges and strategies for effective implementation, indicating a comprehensive approach to integrated pest management in mulberry cultivation.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the abstract you provided has some strengths but also areas that could be improved for scholarly communication:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Clear Intent:</b> The abstract clearly communicates the intent and significance of using bio-control agents in pest management.</li> <li>• <b>Logical Flow:</b> The ideas are presented in a logical sequence, making it easy to follow the argument.</li> </ul> <p><b>Areas for Improvement:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Grammar and Syntax:</b> There are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be refined. For example, "may more or less cost effective" should be corrected to "may be more or less cost-effective."</li> <li>2. <b>Precision:</b> Some statements are vague and could be made more precise. For instance, "may more or less cost effective" is ambiguous.</li> <li>3. <b>Conciseness:</b> The abstract could be more concise by eliminating repetitive information and focusing on the most critical points.</li> <li>4. <b>Technical Terminology:</b> Using more specific technical terms where appropriate can enhance the scholarly tone.</li> <li>5. <b>Balanced View:</b> Including potential limitations or challenges would provide a more balanced perspective, which is important in scholarly writing.</li> </ol>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ayad M. J. Al-Mamoori</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Babylon, Iraq</b>