

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_95895
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing of some summer forage crops to infection by common smut and downy mildew diseases for forage and silage production
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.journaljaeri.com/index.php/JAERI/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1-Yes , the manuscript contains valuable scientific information 2-Yes,it is 3-Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4-Yes 5-Personally, I think the manuscript is wrong from a scientific point of view, because the researcher neglected the external factors that affect the growth of the plant, especially the imported forage crops. Its growth is affected when cultivated in an environment other than its own, so it is not possible to judge the growth rate. 6-The sources are not recent . Other notes: Presentation of the results is good, but there is a weakness in the interpretation of the results, as there is no explanation for most of the impossible results	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is correct	
Optional/General comments	It is preferable to include some pictures of a smut and downy mildew diseases	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Reem Khalid Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Science of Collage, University of Anbar, Iraq