

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97489
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation, purification, identification and pathogenicity of Sclerotinia sclerotiorum (Lib.) de Bary caused Sclerotinia rot of chickpea
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>)

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>Yes, but it is narrow centred with little scientific collaborated discussion</p> <p>Yes The abstract is not comprehensive enough because it has not covered the details of the research work</p> <p>The subsections are not comprehensive and not well discussed. Results are not presented well in each subsection. Results are also not well discussed. The manuscript needs more inputs to make it to be globally accepted and recognised. Most of the references are obsolete and need to be deleted and more recent references added. Citations in text too few and some of the referenced authors are not cited. Please check all your texts and reference list.</p> <p>The results and discussion of the manuscript need to given more attention and then represented for possible publication in the journal.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes except minor errors	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Table in the result section is not well presented and discussed. Values are not well explained in the discussion section.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Victor I. Gwa
Department, University & Country	Federal University Dutsin-Ma, Nigeria