

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJECC_105827
Title of the Manuscript:	Integrated Disease Management (IDM) Modules against karnal bunt (<i>Tilletia indica</i>) of wheat
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://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>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>1 – Yes</p> <p>2 – Not. The term module is not clearing</p> <p>3 – No. MDI combination treatments need clarification. Authors should be able to explain combination treatments and what was tested. In addition, the statistics of the results are missing on M&M and results, as well as if the experimental unit, pot/or plot, are not understandable. Additional comments were on attached file.</p> <p>4 – Yes</p> <p>5 - Yes</p> <p>6 – The reference in general are from 5-10 years older, but I don't have at moment a list of recent researcs to indicate on this theme</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1 – For me its seems well, but I am not a native English person. I thing a specialized review could improve the text quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Most of space on text of Results and Discussion was wasted describing again, and again the combination of IDM treatments. There is many repetition of treatments description with are desgusting (stressful) for the reader. The author have to discover a way to summarize the IDM combined treatments or using another compost acronyms... p.ex. ST (seed treatment), STT seed treatment with thiram, STT+SOBs+FSTA (seed treatment with thiram plus soil treatment with B.subtilis plus fungicidal spraying with tecuconazole and azoxystrobin... or something similar !</p> <p>The negative or of minor grade results were not discussed or summarized ! Even, what could be the major practices or sub-IDM treatments resulting on better bunt Karnal disease control ? The seed treatment ? What seed treatment – the fungicide effect ? Or the soil treatment ? It is possible to discusses the relative importance of each IDM treatment on M11 or M8 ? What was the more efficacious treatments: on seed, soil or plants, based on a over view of the results ?</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sivaldo Felipe da Silveira
Department, University & Country	Darcy Ribeiro North Fluminense State University, Brazil