

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_106077
Title of the Manuscript:	Identifying <i>F. oxysporum</i> Strains Causing Wilt in Southern Indian Chickpeas
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></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript enough important for scientific community. This article explains about identify of <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> strains causing wilt in Southern Indian chickpeas.</p> <p>Yes, appropriate enough</p> <p>Yes, appropriate enough, re-checking is required to be better</p> <p>Yes, appropriate enough</p> <p>Yes, appropriate enough</p> <p>Yes, appropriate enough, if added even better</p> <p>Introduction and discussion need more added deeply explanation to be better. References section need more scientific paper publication</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>re-checking is required to be better</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The writing at the beginning of paragraphs, the number of sentences in 1 paragraph (minimum 3 sentences) was examined again</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rahayu Fitriani Wangsa Putrie</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Research Center for Applied Microbiology, Indonesia</b>