

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_123457
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Weather Parameters on the Infestation of Fall Armyworm <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> (J. E. Smith) in Perambalur District of Tamil Nadu, India
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Title: The title is suitable but could be refined for clarity and impact. Consider revising to: 'Weather Influence on Fall Armyworm Infestation in Maize: A Study in Perambalur District, Tamil Nadu.' ii. Abstract: The abstract is comprehensive, but could benefit from a clearer articulation of the study's significance and practical applications in pest management. Summarize the implications of your findings in the context of improving agricultural practices. iii. Introduction: The introduction provides a good overview of the problem and the study's objectives. However, it would be strengthened by a more detailed review of existing literature on similar studies conducted in other regions, to provide a clearer rationale for this study. iv. Materials and Methods: The methodology is well-detailed, particularly the description of the survey and sampling design. However, further clarification is needed on the selection of specific sampling sites and the rationale for choosing the particular weather parameters studied. Additionally, a discussion on the calibration and accuracy of the instruments used for weather measurement would enhance the reliability of your findings. v. Results and Discussion: The results section is comprehensive, with clear presentation of the data. However, the discussion should be expanded to explore potential reasons for the observed variations in infestation levels across different locations, possibly related to microclimatic differences or crop management practices. The correlation analysis is well-presented, but the discussion could delve deeper into how these findings align with or contrast against existing literature. For example, the negative correlation with minimum temperature and rainfall could be discussed in relation to the fall armyworm's lifecycle and behaviour. vi. Conclusion: The conclusion effectively summarizes the study's key findings. However, it would benefit from a more explicit discussion on how these findings could be applied in practical pest management strategies for farmers in the region. Also, consider highlighting potential areas for future research, such as investigating the long-term impact of climate variability on fall armyworm populations. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable but could be improved for clarity and impact. Suggested revision: 'Weather Influence on Fall Armyworm Infestation in Maize: A Study in Perambalur District, Tamil Nadu.'</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>The abstract is generally comprehensive but could better articulate the study's significance and practical applications. A clearer summary of the implications for agricultural practices would enhance its impact.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured with clear subsections. The flow of information is logical, but the discussion section could be expanded to explore the reasons behind the observed data in more depth.</p>	
<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 study is scientifically robust and methodologically sound. The data is well-analyzed and the conclusions are well-supported by the results. However, a deeper exploration of the correlation findings in the context of existing literature would strengthen the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are generally sufficient and recent, but the inclusion of more up-to-date studies, particularly those exploring similar climatic impacts on fall armyworm in other regions, would further strengthen the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical revisions and a few stylistic improvements could enhance the readability of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Consider adding additional visual aids such as graphs or charts that show the correlation trends between weather parameters and larval populations over time. This would visually support the statistical data and enhance the manuscript's presentation.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aloke Saha
Department, University & Country	University of Kalyani, India