

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101105
Title of the Manuscript:	Promising new systemic fungicides in combating basal stem rot disease of coconut
Type of the Article	Short Research 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)
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)	Yes No. The fungicide used in the study not a newly formulated fungicide. Just a combination of 2 different fungicides to control the disease. No. No. The material and method section is not well explained. The ppm values are each fungicide?. There are specific method to test the inhibition rate of fungi. no no	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	ok	
Optional/General comments	Methodology is not clear and concise. Also no explanation of statistically analysis and research design used. Where is the source of the inoculum comes from? The references does not cover many aspect of the manuscript. The result is not statistically proven	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Norida Mazlan
Department, University & Country	Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia