Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_85140**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ISOLATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF PHYLLOSPHERE MICROFLORA OF MAIZE**
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)

Review Form 1.6

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	**Abstract** The author wrote an introduction to his idea that is not abstract; this section should contain results but only the background and the tests he did were written, hence the most important results obtained should be mentioned. **Introduction** The author cited two manuscripts only published in 1961 and 2003 ??????? how this? The introduction section should contain recent citations besides the aim of his manuscript. **Materials and methods** ▪ No references were mentioned in this section except for biochemical tests (one reference was cited for all tests), are the methods he used novel? ▪ besides he wrote this section 99% identical to the following paper. ▪ DOI: https://doi.org/10.22271/chemi.2020.v8.i6p.10909 ▪ The author mentioned that he used PDA and Nutrient agar media, but he didn't write any tests for fungi he isolated. **Results** ▪ This section was very poor discussed. ▪ No results were mentioned for the isolated fungi although you mentioned that 6 isolates were recovered on PDA (No data in tables, no photos, no testes) ▪ The photos for biochemical tests are blurry without any data.	
Minor REVISION comments	**Conclusion** The author can't conclude his results perfectly, rewrite this section **References** No recent references were cited in this manuscript although many recent manuscripts were published during the period (2019-2022) in this field. The recent reference you cited was been published during 2016, are this logic while we are in 2022 ?	
Optional/General comments	▪ Generally, the manuscript written in poor language, I suggest that the author should review and editing his manuscript carefully. ▪ Although the idea is good, but the working plan is poor.	

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)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Rasha Mohamed Elmeihy**
Department, University & Country	**Benha University, Egypt**