

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes Yes Yes Yes Partially but needs improvement References need to be more comprehensive and exhaustive for a review 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. .	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and vocabulary needs improvement	
Optional/General comments	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	

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:	N Bakthavatsalam
Department, University & Country	ICAR- National Bureau of Agricultural Insect Resources, India