

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_110197
Title of the Manuscript:	POPULATION DYNAMICS OF CARDAMOM SHOOT AND CAPSULE BORER, CONOGETHES PUNCTIFERALIS (GUENEE) ON CARDAMOM VARIETY M2 UNDER HILL ZONE OF KARNATAKA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>1.The manuscript is definitely important for scientific community. This study's findings have practical significance for farmers, add to scientific understanding of pest ecology, and may influence methods for sustainable and successful cardamom farming in Karnataka's hill zone and potentially in comparable agro-ecological situations.</p> <p>2.Replacing the 'under hill zone' by 'in the hill zone' sounds preferable.</p> <p>3. The article is well written and quite straightforward. However, further re-adjustments can lead to better reading. (E.g. 'Correlation studies revealed a significant positive association between shoot infestation and maximum temperature, as well as sunshine hours. In contrast, morning relative humidity showed a significant positive correlation with capsule infestation. Notably, rainfall exhibited a significant negative correlation with both shoot and capsule infestations.' Instead of 'The correlation studies revealed that there was a significant positive correlation with maximum temperature and sunshine hours for shoot infestation. While, morning relative humidity had significantly positive correlation with capsule infestation. However, rainfall had significant negative correlation for both shoot and capsule infestation.'</p> <p>4. Literature review and conclusion, is missing. Anything that supports the main text such as supplementary data or facts are recommended for the addition, however not mandatory.</p> <p>5. Although the paper looks to be scientifically sound, attention to detail in terms of clarity, formatting, and completeness might boost its quality even more.</p> <p>6., The references and recency provided are quite enough to support the information (the recency depends upon the scope and frequency of related research and development.)</p> <p>Other things I would like to add:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. In the introduction Instead of "Southern parts of India," mentioning the precise location or state where little cardamom originates may be more detailed. b. Elaborate on the impact of Abiotic and Biotic factors Before addressing the shoot and capsule borer, provide a quick summary of the abiotic factors impacting cardamom yield. By way of illustration: "The yield of cardamom is influenced by various factors, including both abiotic and biotic elements." 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the provided article generally seem suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Although the article is in just with the scientific writing and may provide a significant contribution to research and proper implications to farming community, I strongly recommend to paraphrase the main and supporting text.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sabin Bhattarai
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Nepal