

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_104685</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Management of pomegranate wilt caused by Ceratocystis fimbriata Ell. and Halst</b>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<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></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>The work is focused on the analysis of the management of pomegranate wilt (Punica granatum L.) caused by Ceratocystis fimbriata Ell. and Halst.</b></p> <p>2. <b>The title expresses the situation under study.</b></p> <p>3. <b>It is necessary to mention the objective and specify the keywords. number of scientific articles reviewed.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The work has an adequate structure.</b></p> <p>5. <b>It is recommended to discuss the results in the context of the experimental design used in the research.</b></p> <p>6. <b>The references are adjusted to the context of the investigation.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Minor: yes, acceptable.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Optional: specify the multiple comparisons test.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Manuel Emilio Milla Pino</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University of Jaen, Peru</b>