

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_95542
Title of the Manuscript:	Trichoderma sp : An amended compost and biopesticide used as organic substrates over soil borne fungal diseases of Kota district ( Rajasthan)
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<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. <b>Yes, this article would be important to those in the biotechnology and microbiology fields.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, the title is suitable.</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract mentions that the tricho-compost was applied over diseased vegetable crops. The results are not discussed, but the methodology is along with a reference to the study. As a review, I feel the results should be discussed, or alternatively remove this from the abstract. The reader is led to expect such a discussion from the title and abstract.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes, the subsections and structure are appropriate.</b></p> <p>5. <b>As a review, it is difficult to judge this point since very little data is presented.</b></p> <p>6. <b>All of the references date prior to 2007, and most prior to 2000. The author(s) do not make a good case why the most important reference (Diba, 2007), has taken on a new relevance since the report was previously published.</b></p> <p>I believe overall it has a good framework for an important review of this topic. However, the relevance in 2023 is not explained well to the reader.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	No, major grammatical revision is required.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[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>Kevin C. Cannon</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Penn State Abington College, USA</b>