

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_110463
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification Of New Sources Of Resistance Against Cercospora Leaf Spot and Fusarium Wilt Diseases In Cotton
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. It's interesting work, in its potential implications for practical applications in agriculture. If the identified cotton varieties indeed demonstrate resistance to Cercospora leaf spot and Fusarium wilt, this information could significantly impact farming practices, potentially reducing the need for chemical interventions and promoting more sustainable cultivation methods 2. Suitable 3. The abstract of this article is sufficiently comprehensive in presenting information related to the research theme 4. It's OK 5. The article is scientifically correct, but, the methodology section needs to be elaborated in detail to ensure readers a comprehensive understanding of the research process 6. References, there are several citations are not in accordance with standard bibliography writing guidelines.	As suggested, necessary modifications were carried out in Methodology section and references.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English-language article is suitable for scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments	In this work, Identification Of New Sources Of Resistance Against Cercospora Leaf Spot and Fusarium Wilt Diseases In Cotton . It is an interesting work, but the Methods and References section are poorly described and should be solved. There are some parts that require improvement. For more details, please refer to the following: 1. Providing information about the age of the plants used as samples is crucial. The age of the plants can influence their susceptibility to diseases, and it also helps in understanding the stage of the crop cycle during which Cercospora leaf spot and Fusarium wilt prevalence is being assessed. This information contributes to the interpretation of disease dynamics in relation to plant development. 2. Clarification is needed regarding whether leaf samples were collected for both diseases or if separate samples were taken for each disease. Understanding the sampling strategy is essential for accurately attributing disease prevalence to specific pathogens. If the same samples were used for both diseases, it's important to explain this approach. 3. Explanation is required regarding how the sample size was determined to ensure accurate representation of the plant population. The rationale behind the chosen sample size is crucial for assessing the reliability and validity of prevalence data. 4. It is essential to elaborate on the statistical approach employed to provide detailed information about the research. Describing the statistical methods used for data analysis will enhance the transparency and credibility of the study. This information helps readers understand how the prevalence data were interpreted and whether the findings are statistically significant. 5. Clarification is needed regarding whether there was any treatment with both fungal isolates before sampling. Understanding if the plants were subjected to any specific treatments or if the study was conducted under natural, untreated conditions is important for assessing the external factors that may have influenced the prevalence of these diseases. 6. References: Pls double-check: there are several citations are not in accordance with standard bibliography writing guidelines.	2. Separate samples were collected for each disease. 4. RBD method was used for statistical analysis. 5. Study was conducted under natural conditions with artificial inoculation for the development of disease. 6. Citations were mentioned as per the guidelines.

[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>	