

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_96903
Title of the Manuscript:	Production of Acetic Indole Acid in Macrophomina phaseolina.
Type of the Article	Original 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

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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 REVISION comments		
<p>1. <u>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</u></p> <p>2. <u>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</u></p> <p>3. <u>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</u></p> <p>4. <u>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</u></p> <p>5. <u>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</u></p> <p>6. <u>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</u> (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is very important for the scientific community and offers interesting ideas for research.</p> <p>The title of the article is apt and very effective</p> <p>The abstract of the article is exhaustive and ensures that the reader immediately understands the investigation.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and complete at all points.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct The references are sufficient and recent but I would still improve them to ensure that scholars can better study the paper examined.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. <u>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</u>		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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>
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:	Carmine Boniello
Department, University & Country	University of Salerno, Italy