

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_103645</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Management of root-knot nematode on okra through Bio-control agents</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes,the manuscript important for scientific community.A pot study was conductedand well explained by the researchers to assess the efficacy of various fungal and bacterial antagonists as seed coating treatments against <i>Meloidogyne javanica</i>, a root-knot nematode that infects okra plants.</p> <p>Yes the title of the article suitable</p> <p>Yes the abstract of the article is comprehensive</p> <p>Yes the subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate</p> <p>Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>I encourage the authors to revise the manuscript and to resubmit it with recent reported work.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This is an interesting study and the authors have reported well.I encourage the authors to revise the manuscript and to resubmit it with recent reported work.With the right changes . I have provided numerous remarks highlighted to be changed (bioagents or Bioagents) creating confusion.Botanical name has to be italicized throughout.Tabulation of content is not specific . I believe that this manuscript can make a valuable contribution after these minor revisions.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>D.Gnanasangeetha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>PSNA College of Engineering and Technology, India</b>