

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99713
Title of the Manuscript:	Qualified studies on the pathogenic variability of Alternaria brassicae, the causal agent of blight disease of rapeseed-mustard
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>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Need Improvement</p> <p>Need Improvement</p> <p>Relatively Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>This paper presents a study on "<i>Qualified studies on the pathogenic variability of <i>Alternaria brassicae</i>, the causal agent of blight disease of rapeseed-mustard</i>" The results of this paper bring some useful information. The topic of this paper falls within the scope of the International Journal of Environment and Climate Change. The contribution of this paper sounds good; the contents are well performed. I would like to suggest the acceptance of this paper. Some detailed comments and suggestions are given as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The article title is appropriate. • The abstract need to be improved upon. Abstract should lay out five key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale (1-2 sentences) - why was the research needed? Objective (1 sentence)- what were you trying to provide to meet that need? Method(s) (up to 3 sentences) - briefly summarize what and which parameters were measured. Results (up to 4-5 sentences)- what did you find? Please add some data to demonstrate the findings. Conclusions/Recommendations (1 sentence) - so what should be done with or in response to your findings? • Keywords is appropriate 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. Kindly fix it.• Novelty of the work is not established.• The purpose or purported significance of the article is not explicitly stated.• Your Methodology need to be improved upon. It should provide context to the research you are presenting and investigating, but the research methodology is not presented sufficiently• In data collection of the individual's subsection,<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Please mention the model of balance.- Please indicate the situation, type, model and all necessary details.- Please mention the method of selection of individuals in the study. - How the study was designed?- How the study was carried out?- How the data were analyzed?• Authors use of transitional words to highlight clear and thoughtful connections among ideas is impressive.• The result and discussion section need to be separated for better understanding. However, the discussion can be improved upon by correlating 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 results. Kindly frame it along the following lines:<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Main findings of the present studyii. Comparison with other studiesiii. Implication and explanation of findingsiv. Strengths and limitationsv. Conclusion, recommendation, and future direction.• Conclusion is scanty and need improvement• The references are comprehensive and appropriate.• There is enough new content in this paper to distinguish it from other works.• The submission provides enough new material for journal publication. <p>Specific Reviewer Comments and Suggestions:</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	a) Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article (in 100-200 words):	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raimi Morufu Olalekan
Department, University & Country	Niger Delta University, Nigeria