

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 |

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> | 1. This study provides valuable insights into several plant extracts that hold potential as bioagents for controlling fungal growth. The findings offer significant information on the effectiveness of these extracts in inhibiting fungal proliferation, highlighting their potential applications in agriculture and beyond. 2. Suitable 3. The abstract of this article is sufficiently comprehensive in presenting information related to the methods, but the correction of scientific species name format needed. 4. It’s OK 5. The article is scientifically correct, however, the (Methods section) requires a more detailed elaboration, especially in the isolation procedure of plant extract. Additionally, there is a need for improvement in sentence structure, particularly in the use of citation numbers at the beginning of sentences, and the placement of the analysis methods which seem to be misplaced (Result and Discussion section) 6. References, there are several citations are not in accordance with standard bibliography writing guidelines. | After corrections , following are the comments; 1. Yes. I do agree with the opinion as these findings can be useful in developing safer and more eco-friendly methods to control powdery mildew and protect crops. 2. Yes. I agree. 3. Yes. The necessary corrections are done. 4. further relevant changes are done as per the guidelines given. 5. As the plants extracts used are crude, there is no any specific need to mention the isolation procedure as said. The result and discussion section had been revised as per the suggestions. 6. references are cited as per the guidelines. |
| 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 | Yes, I do agree. |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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) | NO |