

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_84553
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of fungicides against <i>Bipolaris sorokiniana</i> under in vitro and in vivo conditions
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>It is an important research topic with meaningful results; therefore, this work can be published. However; some few adjustments should be done (as follows):</p> <p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>Please, review the sentence: "The harmful effects of fungicides to human and environment, there have been proved useful and economical in the control of spot blotch". It seems harmful effects are welcome.</p> <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>The paragraphs that discuss tables 3 and 4 ("Data presented in Table 3" .... "Similarly, in both the years" .... "Data presented in Table 4" etc.) present slightly different values than those found in the respective tables. please verify</p> <p><b>References:</b></p> <p>Text cited "Malakar and Milan, 2009" but References present Malaker, P.K., Saha, N.K., Rahman, M.M., Hussain, A.B.S., Haque, M. and Kabir, K.H. (2009). Yield loss assessment of wheat due to <i>Helminthosporium</i> blight at farmer's field. <i>Bangladesh. J. Sci. Res.</i> <b>29</b>: 49-57</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Some acronym (for instance PDA) could be explained</p>	<p>Explained</p>

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	