

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_113263
Title of the Manuscript:	“Evaluation of the most effective plant extracts, bioagents and chemical fungicides in vitro against powdery mildew of pea.”
Type of the Article	Short 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>     <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p><b>Yes, Powdery mildew diseases in different plants cause a great loss to the Agriculturist and horticulturist. Control it by using biological methods will protect us from the harmful effects of chemicals. This research is important from a scientific point of view.</b></p> <p><b>I think It should be “Evaluation of Plant Extracts, Bioagents, and Chemical Fungicides in Vitro against Powdery Mildew of Pea” better than the provided title.</b></p> <p><b>No. The Abstract is not in the correct format as given in the guidelines (Template). The background, methodology, and conclusion are not clear. Citation in the Abstract?</b></p> <p><b>No. The structure and the subsection are not as mentioned in the template., All the structure is small letters not capitalized and the font style is in Times Roman? the colon(:) and the dash(-) in the subsection and section are not needed in the article. So, strictly follow the guidelines while preparing the manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>No.</b></p> <p><b>No. additional and recent references are required. References are not cited properly in the</b></p> <p><b>Major and serious revision of the manuscript is necessary. Follow the guidelines while preparing. The citation is very weak. Must improve in all the sections of the manuscript.</b></p>	<p>1. Yes. I do agree with the opinion.</p> <p>2. Yes. I do agree with the suggested title.</p> <p>3. Citation in abstract are removed and corresponding changes mentioned has been done as per the guidelines given.</p> <p>4. The changes has been made as per guidelines and highlighted in yellow colour.</p> <p>5. Changes are made as per suggestions and guidelines.</p> <p>6. Additional recent references are added and cited as per the guidelines.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<p>No. Has to work hard to maintain the quality.</p>	<p>Required changes are made as per the suggestions.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Major and serious revision is required.</p> <p>Abstract ..The efficacy of bioagents was evaluated by preparing the bacterial and fungal culture filtrates (Hassan and Eman.,2017), why citation, no background, very short methodology, and no conclusion'</p> <p>Introduction: only one citation? The introduction part lacks the objectives, only about fungicide in introduction ?</p> <p>Materials and Methods: not clear</p> <p>Results and Discussion: only result is written no Discussion ?</p> <p>Conclusion only the results is highlighted?</p> <p>References and citation</p> <p>Not properly cited .</p>	<p>Citations are removed from corresponding section. Introduction also corrected by adding few recent citations, also added objectives about study related to bioagents and plant extracts apart from fungicides.</p> <p>Methodology: some relevant changes are made as per suggestions.</p> <p>Results and discussion : Discussion also added with relevant citations.</p> <p>Conclusion: based on results, the conclusion of the study is added as per suggestions.</p>

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	<p>No.</p>