

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_117033
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient strategies for pest resilience in plants: A Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Partially but needs improvement</p> <p>References need to be more comprehensive and exhaustive for a review</p> <p>The article is attempting to provide a review on the interaction between plant nutrition and insect nutrition and the application of the knowledge in insect pest management . The article provides some references on the nutrition . However I do not see a complete review of the aspect. Much work has been done on these aspects, the authors should have referred the articles and written a comprehensive review. For me it looks like a chapter of Review of literature of a M. S or Ph D thesis. The information provided is too basic is at several places and does not seem to qualify for a review article.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, the suggestions are carried out in the article</p> <p>Yes, the corrections are carried out as suggested by reviewer</p> <p>Thanks for the comments, reviewer. The corrections in the article are carried out as suggested by reviewer</p>
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and vocabulary needs improvement</p>	<p>Yes, the language of the article is corrected</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The authors should attempt to write a comprehensive review after going through excellent articles already written on this aspect and try to add or synthesize new information and provide a crispy review. As such , the article needs a through restructuring and reforming for consideration for publication</p>	<p>Thanks for the comments by reviewer and it the corrections in the manuscript are carried out as suggested by reviewer</p>

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>	No