

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_111107
Title of the Manuscript:	In-vitro evaluation of fungicides and botanicals against Uromyces ciceris arietini inciting chickpea rust disease
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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes, agree but not Strongly agree Yes, Suitable Yes, Abstract is comprehensive Yes Yes but not as much, Author has not put figures in the manuscript, why? This is like review article. Manuscript should have figures of results. According to Article and written materials references are sufficient.	Agree Agree Agree Agree This is invitro study conducted with cavity slide method, no figures added Agree
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Manuscript is written well but it is like review article. Author has written just data that can be write without performing the experiment. He should give some figures of Invivo activity.References have different format according to the journal. Author should have to read the journal guidelines properly.Materials and Method is not written properly. Many questions can be arisen. Frome where he has collected the fungi. Where is Pathogenicity test. Where is Fungus Microscopy? How he knows it is fungus or Bacteria? How he analysed fungus during experiment that fungus was same before and after invivo activity.There are some grammatical errors. Please Correct the grammatical errors.Add recent references and format according to journal.	This manuscript is based on PhD thesis Submitted to mpkv rahuri MH In vivo results will be published separately Corrected Added Corrected some Corrected

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>	No