

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_95393</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of maize genotypes against banded leaf and sheath blight incited by <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> f. sp. <i>sasakii</i> under artificial epiphytotic conditions</b>
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Reviewer #1: I reread carefully manuscript number: [Ms_IJPSS_95393], the manuscript entitled: "<b>Evaluation of maize genotypes against banded leaf and sheath blight incited by Rhizoctonia solani f. sp. sasakii under artificial epiphytotic conditions</b>". This is an engaging article that purposefully question our knowledge of the subject. However, the manuscript needs to be improved. The paper is challenged on many fronts with regard to the implementation of this larger objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The article title is appropriate.</li> <li>• The abstract accurately reflects the content</li> <li>• Keywords is ok.</li> <li>• Introduction is relatively ok</li> <li>• The purpose or purported significance of the article is explicitly stated.</li> <li>• Your Methodology should provide context to the research you are presenting and investigating. Please check the accuracy of this section.</li> <li>• The justification of the study is missing</li> <li>• Details of sampling months are missing</li> <li>• Details of Statistical analysis are missing</li> <li>• In data collection of the individual's subsection, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please mention the model of balance.</li> <li>- Please indicate the situation, type, model and all necessary details.</li> <li>- Please mention the method of selection of individuals in the study.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The quality of the English in the manuscript is so poor as to render the science presented unclear. Check the English Grammar. Please check all parts of the manuscript and correct grammatical errors. The authors should ask the help of native English-speaking proofreader, because there are some linguistic mistakes that should be fixed.</li> <li>• Authors should use transitional words mindfully to highlight clear and thoughtful connections among ideas.</li> <li>• The language can be substantially improved for clarity, concision, better grammar and logic. Thus, the manuscript needs to be properly formatted and resubmitted?</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are few grammatical and spelling mistakes. Please double check you text and correct them all.</li> <li>• Make sure that all the tables are quoted in the text and in correct order, too.</li> <li>• Also, it will be valuable to add a conceptual chart with the main steps with the new survey methodology approach.</li> <li>• The manuscript needs to be properly formatted and resubmitted?</li> <li>• Separate result from Discussion</li> <li>• Discussion section: Describe the major findings of your study in the opening sentence. Correlation of your results with previous literature is essential. So, discuss your own results before relating them to the results of other published work. Then correlate your work with at least 7-8 recent publications either in support or in contradiction for justification of your study.</li> <li>• The conclusions is accurate and supported by the content. Add the specific value, problems and challenges of the findings in the conclusion.</li> <li>• The references are comprehensive. Consult journal reference style.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<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:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Raimi Morufu Olalekans</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Niger Delta University, Nigeria</b></p>