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**

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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**-For an original research article, the manuscript is very short. This paper should be a short communication.** **-The title is suitable.** **-The abstract lacks a future use of the study/findings** **-Would have been better if the manuscript can be expanded a bit more through discussing more of the results. The author should provide more evidence why the pathogen is limited. For example, as the treatment T4 i.e., Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25% w/w WG and treatment T5 i.e., Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% w/w SC were found effective, then what component/s of these treatments (differ to other treatments) have which make them more effective on negating the pathogen? Later, you can add other findings to support your own findings.** **-You can also add more information about your treatments in the introduction.** **-It is correct but for an original publication, it needs additional in-vivo findings.** **-Should add more reference.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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:	**Aldrin Yanong Cantila**
Department, University & Country	**The University of Western Australia, Australia**