

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_109529
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and cultural, morphological characterization of <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> causing seedling blight in rice
Type of the Article	Short communication

## Review Form 1.7

### 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. 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. It tackles a critical process in our food chain that needs to be identified early enough so that we don't get to food insufficiency.</p> <p>2. The title is relevant.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive enough. It leads the reader to introduction of the problem, methodology, results obtained in the process. One is able to follow and understand scientifically.</p> <p>4. The subsections and the structure follow the scientific structure of presentation which makes it appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct and scientific methodologies have been used. The reference of Kochs postulate can be identified in having a clean crop, then introduce a pathogen and leave it to grow. When the same symptoms are exhibited then that is a positive identification.</p> <p>6. The references are somehow sufficient. However, a lot has been done like the research on <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> Sacc. In <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> in Uganda in 2020 by Pamela Paparu et al., 2020 that cab be referred.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Ok</p> <p>Noted and revised</p> <p>Revision made</p>
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Totally agree</p>	<p>ok</p>
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Reviewer General comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paper is standard and meet the requirements for publication.</li> <li>The author clearly understands the scope and causal agent and its characteristics.</li> <li>Pathogenicity test was clear with follow up Kochs postulate recommendations until the causal agent was positively identified.</li> <li>In introduction section, reolace , Illnesses with diseases as illness is more pronounced in human beings and animals.</li> <li>Some reference dates back to 1951, in a scientific paper we try as much as possible to make science current. Check out works done in Uganda by Pamela Paparu et al., 2020 and Jie Zhong et al., 2016.</li> </ul>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	