

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_94278</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Efficacy of different levels of NPK against Anthracnose of King chilli (<i>Capsicum chinense</i>) caused by <i>Colletotrichum gloeosporioides</i> (Penz.) and impact on their growth parameters and yield in Manipur.</b>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>The manuscript displays overall good results though I have some minor confusions which need to be cleared for readers and other researchers that follow the general experiment. Following are few comments.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. My primary concern is that whether the reduction in yield is due to disease or NPK ratio up down.? OR NPK is used for disease control.?</li> <li>2. How the authors co-relate the yield reduction with disease and NPK treatments.?</li> <li>3. Is there any association of NPK with disease control. Please clarify.?</li> <li>4. What else parameters altered with these treatments.?</li> <li>5. Or the treatments made plants healthy to fight against disease itself by activating own defence system and other defensive regulatory pathways.?</li> <li>6. Few recent references should be added in introduction section to further elaborate the problem.?</li> <li>7. How the pathogen was isolated and identified and further maintained not very clear written in M&amp;M section.?</li> <li>8. Please read the whole manuscript and rewrite poor grammatically sentences in correct way and cite references.?</li> <li>9. Discusses logically the discussion section why your results are similar or differ from other results.?</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Generally, the idea is good need to be polished and even more precise correctly for the readers. The manuscript contains information for the concerned areas and will address the pathogen and their control.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Izhar Muhammad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Institute for Genomics and Biotechnology, Pakistan</b>