

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_106099
Title of the Manuscript:	Harnessing the Antifungal Potential of Seed Bacteriome against Major Seed and Soil-borne Pathogens in Blackgram
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>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>A good research paper after taking notes</p> <p>A good research paper after taking notes</p> <p>A good research paper after taking notes</p> <p>Quite good</p> <p>Appropriate</p> <p>Yes, with notes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The percentage of inhibition in Is it a percentage that should be clarified.</p> <p>Any recommendations not found in the summary.</p> <p>More clarification of the purpose of the research in the introduction.</p> <p>Some scientific sources on working methods are very old.</p> <p>The explanation of the MOLECULAR CHARACTERISATION method is too lengthy to be shortened.</p> <p>There were no MOLECULAR CHARACTERISATION images in the results.</p> <p>The researcher did not explain the reason for selecting 14 bacterial isolates</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Hussein L. Alboory
Department, University & Country	Al-Qasim Green University, Iraq