

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95056
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological Screening of Black Gram Genotypes with reference to Mungbean yellow Mosaic virus
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is very important to all workers in plant disease field.</p> <p>Yes, somewhat appropriate</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, to some extent</p> <p>Some references is very old, deals with the survey, but if there is no recent references deals with the same point, so it could be accepted</p> <p>Some other comments are summarized in the attached file "Reviewer Comments" and "Reference Check"</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, to some extent</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript could not be accepted as it is. Major corrections are needed before acceptance for publication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All correction needed are listed in their places. - The author did not mention any statistical analysis tables or figures for comparing between different examined varieties. - This research was conducted for only one year, with only 2 replicates, where in any field experiment, the work should last at least for two successive years, and the replicates should be at least three replicates. - The author did not mention the existed figure in any place of the text. - The 'Wheeler' formula is written incorrect. - Results and discussion is very short and poor - More references are needed, that related to the recent work and the discussion with other researchers. - Reference list must be corrected and rearranged. - One missed reference [Number 9 not mentioned in the text] either complete it or remove and rearrange the sequence. - Uniform the style of reference editing. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamed Ahmed Gesraha
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt