

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95974
Title of the Manuscript:	Incidence and Intensity of Early Blight in Potato under different dates of Planting
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>)

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>1. The manuscript is limited to describe a particular phenomenon which is difficult to apply to another situation.</p> <p>2. The title says "under different dates"; but only were evaluates two planting dates and one locality.</p> <p>3. The abstract does not present a discussion about the results observed.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. The manuscript does not present a discussion. The manuscript is limited to describing results and, in some cases, comparing them with those of other publications without elucidating the causes of the associations found.</p> <p>6. The references are not recent. The most recent is from 7 years ago.</p> <p>7. The Introduction does not abord recent topics about relationship of Early Blight with ambiental conditions.</p> <p>8. Tuber yield is not evaluated which diminishes the value of the manuscript.</p> <p>9. Conclusions are too extensive.</p> <p>10. Some variables do not have normal distribution, specially percents. Then, some analyses should be realized whit non parametric scope.</p> <p>11. Characteristics of the evaluated varieties should be described.</p> <p>12. The manuscript is written with many capture errors.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Wording should be reviewed by an expert.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juan Enrique Rodríguez Pérez
Department, University & Country	Chapingo Autonomus University, México