

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125826
Title of the Manuscript:	In Vitro evaluation of Trichoderma species and some selected botanical extracts against Alternaria helianthi (Hansf) causing Alternaria blight of sunflower
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Biological control is being explored since the last three decades and role of <i>Trichoderma</i> against air-, seed- or soil-borne fungal pathogens is a proved fact. So, to be very precise, <i>in vitro</i> evaluation of <i>Trichoderma</i> does not add any extra importance for the scientific community. In contrary, use of plant extracts or botanicals is a less explored area and adds some value in this regard to the field of science. But <i>in vivo</i> field experiment is much more in need.	Yes
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	1. Key words to be added maintaining alphabetic order. 2. The abstract says “The potential for integrating bio-agents and botanicals in eco-friendly management strategies”, but no experiment has been conducted integrating the two in support.	Noted
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, partly. In the introduction part, the content to be written from the next line of the sub-title instead of the same line.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is technically correct but can’t be called scientifically robust. Only in vitro evaluation doesn’t lead to any conclusion regarding the efficacy of biological antagonists or botanicals.	The manuscript has been updated
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	<ul style="list-style-type: none">References are not sufficient and also not relevant. Especially in the introduction part only one reference related to authors’ work has been mentioned, that too regarding rhizospheric bacteria. Relevant rference of work regarding <i>Trichoderma</i> and botanicals need to be put.In the discussion part some references need to be added also.	The reference list has been updated.

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Two references are not very recent too. One is of 1978 and other is of 1994 which may be changed.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is suitable.	
Optional/General comments	<p>1. The particular objective of the study is not mentioned in the introduction part.</p> <p>2. Why the very concentrations 5%, 10% and 15% chosen is not explained. Generally a series of concentration is chosen randomly with little gap like, 1%, 2.5%, 5%, 7.5%..... and so on. How come the scientists/ workers know which concentration will be working?</p> <p>3. Second thing, ED₅₀ and ED₉₀ values are to be calculated. Only then a concentration can be recommended.</p> <p>4. The comment “potentiality of integrating bio-agents and botanicals in eco-friendly management” can only be made when the experiments on integration of the two agents has been carried out. How come the workers are sure that the bio-agent fungi <i>Trichoderma</i> can grow well in the doses of botanicals recommended by them? As for example, it is quite possible that neem oil is inhibitory to both <i>Alternaria</i> and <i>Trichoderma</i>.</p> <p>5. Table 2, 3 and 4 can be merged.</p> <p>6. Both table and the graphical representation of the same make the article fatty and clumsy. Either of the two is recommended.</p> <p>7. Reason behind using Hexaconazole is mentioned in the discussion part only, which may be mentioned in the Materials and Method section also for a better reasoning.</p> <p>7. Lastly, The scientific names are to be written in italics and without spelling mistake in each case, which is missing in some places. For example, in the introduction part ‘Alternaria helianthin’ is written instead of <i>Alternaria helianthi</i>.</p>	Updated

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)	