

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_120908
Title of the Manuscript:	Eco-friendly management of Purple blotch (<i>Alternaria porri</i>) of onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it presents novel insights and advances in the field of study. It contributes to a deeper understanding of the subject matter, filling gaps in current knowledge and potentially guiding future research directions. I appreciate this manuscript for its rigorous methodology, thorough analysis, and clear presentation of findings, which collectively enhance its credibility and impact. However, there might be areas where the study could be further improved, such as expanding the sample size or exploring additional variables, to strengthen its conclusions.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Eco-friendly management of Purple blotch (<i>Alternaria porri</i>) of onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.)" is suitable for the article. It effectively summarizes the key focus of the study, which is the management of Purple blotch disease in onions using eco-friendly methods. The title clearly indicates the subject (Purple blotch disease caused by <i>Alternaria porri</i>), the crop affected (onion, <i>Allium cepa</i> L.), and the nature of the management approach (eco-friendly), making it informative and relevant to the content of the research.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive Coverage: The abstract provides a clear overview of the study, including the crop, disease, treatments, and results. - Clarity and Focus: The purpose, methods, and key findings are well-stated. - Scientific Rigor: Specific details such as the randomized block design and exact treatments are included, demonstrating the study's rigor. - Readability: The abstract is concise and to the point. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate as they follow the standard format for scientific research papers, ensuring clarity and comprehensiveness. The inclusion of sections such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion provides a logical flow and thorough presentation of the research. Each subsection effectively addresses key components of the study, from background information and experimental design to detailed results and their implications. This structure enhances readability and allows for a clear understanding of the research objectives, methods, findings, and significance.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by clearly defining the research objectives and following a well-structured experimental design. The use of a randomized block design with multiple treatments and controls ensures the reliability and validity of the results. The detailed methodology, including specific quantities and types of organic manures and fungicides used, allows for reproducibility and transparency. The statistical analysis of disease intensity and yield outcomes further supports the robustness of the findings, indicating that the conclusions drawn are based on solid empirical evidence. Overall, the manuscript is technically sound, providing a comprehensive evaluation of the effects of organic manures and fungicides on Purple blotch disease in onions.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and relevant to the study's focus on the impact of organic manures and fungicides on Purple blotch disease in onions.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is generally clear and concise, with appropriate use of technical terminology.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Nguyen Thi Lang
Department, University & Country	Vietnam