

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_121229
Title of the Manuscript:	INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT OF COLLAR ROT OF CHICK PEA (<i>Cicer arietinum</i>) CAUSED BY <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> UNDER GREEN HOUSE CONDITIONS
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Fungal diseases are common diseases that cause a lot of damage to all kinds of agricultural products. It is very important to control these diseases without chemical poisons. Because we are currently facing many environmental risks related to chemical toxins.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Materials and methods, if done as written in the text, are scientifically correct. The results are properly checked and statistical analyzes are available in the text.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	See the attachment	

Review Form 3

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:	Parviz Sharifiziveh
Department, University & Country	Iran