



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_65689
Title of the Manuscript:	Field evaluation of Indofil M-45 against Fruit rot (Colletotrichum sp.) Leaf spot (Alternaria and Cercospora) disease of Pomegranate
Type of the Article	

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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)																				
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>*The work seems to be important, and rubust, however, for me as a microbiologist and phytopathologist I found that the manuscript lack of some information. In case of the evaluation a fungicide we always pass through <i>in vitro</i> trials, to have an idea of the capacity of the later of the inhibition of any pathogen, to do the <i>in vivo</i> trials then the field trials ... the work lack of that unfortunately.</p> <p>*Please mention the active ingredient not the commercial product, we are not promoting any commercial products. For that the title also need to be revised</p> <p>*How did you know that the pathogen you work on are Alternaria and Cercospora, you did isolate them or identified them to correlate the disease to the pathogen please to clarify.</p> <p>What formulat you have used to transform % to arcsin ??? I verified your table using this formulat and I found some varieties =DEGRES(ASIN(RACINE(pourcentage/100))) (the fomulat is in french)</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>table 1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>0,82</td><td>6,53</td><td>10,5</td><td>16,23</td></tr><tr><td>What you have mentioned</td><td>4,93</td><td>14,79</td><td>18,89</td><td>23,76</td></tr><tr><td>What I got using the right formulat</td><td>5,19547055</td><td>14,8055048</td><td>18,9072443</td><td>23,7573899</td></tr></table> <p>*Please to see my other comments on the Ms</p>		table 1					0,82	6,53	10,5	16,23	What you have mentioned	4,93	14,79	18,89	23,76	What I got using the right formulat	5,19547055	14,8055048	18,9072443	23,7573899	<p>Noted</p> <p>Revision amended</p> <p>Noted</p>
	table 1																					
	0,82	6,53	10,5	16,23																		
What you have mentioned	4,93	14,79	18,89	23,76																		
What I got using the right formulat	5,19547055	14,8055048	18,9072443	23,7573899																		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>*Language needs to be improved, Short form should be describing and add a line of conclusion / future prospects in abstract.</p> <p>*You should verify the reference as suggested by the journal. I see that you used few you should add more according to your work and add newer one 2018-2020</p> <p>Please to see my comments on the MS</p>	<p>Language has been improved</p> <p>OK</p>																				
<u>Optional/General</u> 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)	