

**Review form 1.7**

Journal name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_104217</b>
Manuscript title:	<b>Screening of sesame genotypes against powdery mildew and Macrophomina stem/root rot diseases</b>
Item Type	

**General guideline for the peer review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected solely on the basis of "lack of novelty", as long as the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. For the complete guide to the 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 comment	Author comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors are required to write their comments here)
<p><b>Mandatory REVIEW Feedback</b></p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community?</b> (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article appropriate?</b> (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article complete?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers can provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript reveals: It is suggested that the words be worked with the UNESCO THESAURUS, which is a universal glossary that allows locating the text within a specific field of science: Agriculture - Crop - Sesame... Well defined problem and justification. The context where the research will be carried out is not indicated; the exploratory experimental design is ideal for this type of study. The selected population is relevant. The formula to be used for reading the results is appropriate. The results use a System of Units suitable for reading; In addition, the results are compared with other studies, revealing the new findings in the employment and proper use of techniques that can combat this stem-root disease. It would be important to mention the future lines of research that can start from this study. In the absence of the objective of the investigation, its conclusions cannot be appreciated.</p> <p>2. The title given is appropriate.</p> <p>3. It is important to mention the objective of the research; the methodology is relevant as are the results. It is necessary to state the conclusions.</p> <p>4. The structure responds to the requirements of a scientific article.</p> <p>5. The writing is scientifically pertinent.</p> <p>6. The references present a weakness in their updating (2 updated references). It would be important to expand at least between 30 -50.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVIEW Feedback</b></p> <p><b>1. Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Appropriate	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>		

**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>Jeverosn Santiago Quishpe Gaibor</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador</b>