

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99255
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro suppression of soil borne plant pathogens by glomalin produced by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi
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> )

### 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</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The study is important however, the explanation of the subject is insufficient.</p> <p>2-The title is not suitable. The alternative title is below this sentence. The arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi to the control of soil-borne plant pathogens under in vitro conditions</p> <p>3-The abstract of the article is not compressive.</p> <p>4-The tables are not sufficient; also irregular</p> <p>5- Fungi isolated method is not included.</p> <p>6-No - The author should write, what is the aim of this study and should give some examples similar to their study in introduction.</p> <p>-Material method is not sufficient. The author should determine their study period. In addition, how and when did you do your survey? You should explain.</p> <p>-What is method of identifying fungi? You should write methods and identification keys. How did you calculate the isolation rates of the fungi? It is necessary to specify. Results shows are not suitable.</p> <p>- Discussion is not enough. It is necessary to discuss your results with other studies. Both isolation and mycorrhizal fungi results should discuss.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	No	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Işılav Lavkor
Department, University & Country	Biological Control Research Institute, Turkey