

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_94868
Title of the Manuscript:	Survey, isolation frequency and pathogenicity of root rot pathogen of Cedrus deodara (Roxb.) G. Don in district Solan, Himachal Pradesh
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://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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract section does not have any review of the importance of the study, of the area, it only lists some results, it must be rewritten with better writing and include the predominant aspects of an abstract as the objective of the study.</p> <p>The introduction section lacks a rigorous literature review, there are only three reference sources</p> <p>The authors don't explain why was calculated pooled mean and why this data its important</p> <p>Table 2 is not explained at all, there is no information on the meaning of the number in parentheses, it is the authors' obligation to detail the information provided to the reader, the titles of tables and graphs must describe the information presented, it is not enough to just put a title</p> <p>The authors did not present information on how the DNA extractions of the isolates were carried out; if it was an external service, it is necessary to include the minimum technical information. There is no information on the program used to perform the phylogeny analyses and the graph shown does not have an outgroup</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The materials and methods section do not include the year in which the sampling was carried out, there are quite a few writing and spelling errors.	
Optional/General comments	The quality of the photographs is not good, their titles do not contain more information	

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:	Kelly Avila
Department, University & Country	Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario, Colombia