

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_83594
Title of the Manuscript:	SURVEY OF INSECT PESTS AND NATURAL ENEMIES ASSOCIATED WITH CHILLI IN VARIOUS DISTRICTS OF KYMORE PLATEAU & SATPURA HILLS ZONE OF MADHYA PRADESH
Type of the 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>)

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	<p>(1) Author started abstract with methodology, instead of introduction about pest/crop. Hence, the abstract should include introduction, methodology, result and conclusion in sequence.</p> <p>(2) Material and method section is very poorly written. It must answer several queries. Author has not mentioned the detailed method of observing insects. Whether they were recorded per plant/leaf/twig etc. need to be mentioned in M&M section. How the microscopic mites are observed per leaf? In the field or lab. ? Sampling part, sampling method, sampling size is missing.</p> <p>(3) Survey data must include the time (may be meteorological standard week) of incidence/occurrence of pests.</p> <p>(4) How many times the pest population was monitored. Whether data presented is mean of several observations / visits? if data is based on only one observation/visit, then it's a poor representation. How many observations were recorded during each crop stage?</p> <p>(5) At several places author has mentioned "peak mean population". Usually there will be a single peak per crop stage / crop growing season. How the mean of peak is calculated in each crop stage per district ? In text author mentions "peak mean population" while in table it is mentioned as just "mean population". Author must clear the confusion.</p> <p>(6) Conclusion part is missing at the end of MS. The study must be concluded to convey results properly to the readers.</p> <p>(7) the pest population may be subjected to appropriate statistical tool to compare the population across the districts to present the conclusion /inference</p> <p>(8) The results are not properly discussed. However results are simply supported by past literatures. Author must discuss his experimental results to draw the inference.</p> <p>(9) The overall language of the MS need to be improved.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor revisions are mentioned in the MS wherever needed	
Optional/General comments	Title may be modified as suggested in MS	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Sanjay Bandi
Department, University & Country	IIPR, India