

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_104247</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Fungal Endophytes: A Potential Application in Integrated Plant Health Management</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1- Yes, very important but In the Introduction, the role of endophytes in the suppression of various diseases is not well mentioned. Figures and tables are very important to summarize the review so, it is formative if you include them.</p> <p>2- The title is okay</p> <p>3- It needs somewhat to add conclusions, recommendations and future directions in the abstract to be <b>comprehensive</b></p> <p>4- Yes, I am happy with the way the Authors put subsections.</p> <p>5- Yes, it is okay</p> <p>6- Yes, it is sufficient and approximately 50% of them are 2015-2022 which is best and recent</p> <p><b>Other comments have been presented in the main text.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>- Redo your abstract introducing the research gap to conclusions, why you are reviewing this title</p> <p>- See again part of conclusion, add your recommendation and put future directions</p> <p>- Your referencing numbering needs to be corrected; you have to put as you put in the whole body starting from Introduction to final page. Don't put according to alphabetical order.</p> <p>- Expand your conclusion by including recommendations and future directions</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Gizachew Hirpa Regasa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia</b>