

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_108977
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro evaluation of Botanicals, Bio-agents and Fungicides against Rhizoctonia solani causing Web blight disease of Mungbean
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript examines the management of web blight disease in mungbean. It focuses on a practical concern for the agricultural and scientific community. 2. Revised title: "In vitro evaluation of botanicals, bio-agents and fungicides against <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> causing Web blight disease of mungbean". 3. It should be condensed to provide a more concise summary of the research, focusing on the primary objectives, methods, and key findings. 4. The manuscript's structure generally follows a conventional format, but it needs improvement in terms of clarity and organization. 5. Needs substantial revisions to improve its scientific quality. 6. The references cited in the manuscript are limited in number and require expansion. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The language and English quality of the article need improvement 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract should provide a clear and concise summary of the paper. The abstract in this paper is unclear and does not effectively communicate the research focus and findings. It should focus on the main objectives, methods, and key findings of the study. • The introduction should provide a more comprehensive background on the significance of mungbean and its cultivation in India. The introduction lacks proper citations, and it is crucial to provide credible sources to support the claims made. • There are formatting issues, such as inconsistent capitalization of headings, inconsistent use of italics for scientific names, and inconsistent use of units (mm, %) for measurements. • The paper contains numerous grammatical errors, including incomplete sentences and missing prepositions. A thorough proofreading and editing are necessary. • The use of abbreviations (e.g., DAS) should be explained upon first usage to aid reader comprehension. • The citation format is not consistent and does not follow a standard style (e.g., APA, MLA, or others). Proper citation style should be used throughout the paper. • The methods section lacks clarity and detail. It is essential to provide a comprehensive description of the methodology used, including specific procedures for testing botanicals, bio-agents, and fungicides. • The presentation of results is confusing. It is unclear how the data in tables and figures correspond to the treatments and time intervals discussed in the text. • The paper lacks a discussion section where the results are interpreted and placed in the context of previous research. This is a critical component of a research paper. • The paper lacks a clear conclusion section where the main findings and their implications are summarized. • The paper does not offer suggestions for future research, which is typically expected in a research paper. • The paper lacks a clear and logical organization, making it challenging for the reader to follow the flow of information. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The references cited in the paper need to be formatted correctly, following a standardized citation style.	
--	--	--

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:	Harwinder Singh Buttar
Department, University & Country	Punjab Agricultural University, India