

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ IJECC_105591 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Wheat Genotype Evaluation for Spot Blotch Disease Resistance: Unveiling Resilient Varieties |
| 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://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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>Quite good (take notes)</p> <p>Quite good (take notes)</p> <p>Quite good (take notes)</p> <p>Quite good (take notes)</p> <p>Quite good (take notes)</p> <p>Quite good (take notes)</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | yes | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract of the long research paper can be shortened. 2. The recommendations did not mention the abstract of the research paper. 3. The research objective is more clear in terms of staying away from pesticides. 4. The work methods must be documented with scientific sources in the research paper. 5. The method of preparing spore suspension has not been supported by scientific sources. | |

Review Form 1.7

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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Hussein L. Alboory |
| Department, University & Country | Al-Qasim Green University, Iraq |