



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3373
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate Change Impact on Insect Population in Vegetable Crops: A review
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>)



1: Review Comments		
	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback



<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(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>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for the local context in India. However, it needs to be revised first. In its current version it includes a lot of repetition and information that is not referenced properly.</p> <p>2. I suggest the change of the title to read: Impacts of Climate Change on Insect Pests and Crop Production: A Review</p> <p>3. The abstract is OK.</p> <p>4. Sections and subsections of the manuscript need to be revised and repetition be removed.</p> <p>5. It is an important effort that need to be revised to bring the best out of it.</p> <p>6. A lot of the manuscript miss a reference. This should be revised and appropriate referencing should be provided for text in the manuscript.</p> <p><u>I suggest that the authors do the following:</u></p> <p>1. Provide scientific names in full when first mentioned.</p> <p>2. Follow the Journal's guidelines for references style, using a single style consistently.</p> <p>3. Revise the sentence in lines 57-59.</p> <p>4. Mention Table 1 in the text; consider writing a paragraph about diversity and referencing the table.</p> <p>5. Revise the numbering that starts abruptly in line 87.</p> <p>6. Reference and rewrite paragraphs from line 87 to 109.</p> <p>7. Clarify or delete the sentence about the</p>	<p>Okay</p>
--	---	-------------



	<p>effects of elevated temperature on insect pests in line 116 to ensure it fits with the surrounding context.</p> <p>8. Remove repetition and ensure the manuscript's titles are ordered logically.</p> <p>9. Revisit and revise the introductory paragraphs to ensure they flow smoothly from the beginning of the article.</p> <p>10. Consider shortening the article.</p> <p>11. Ensure all information is properly referenced, as this is a review article.</p> <p>12. Revise the redundant paragraph added after the references in lines 434-438, possibly integrating it into the introductory paragraph.</p>	
--	--	--



Minor REVISION comments		
Optional comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	