

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_99252</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Field Evaluation of the Efficacy of Fungicides and Rhizosphere Bacterial Antagonists Against Rice Stem Rot Disease</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research 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

	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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes, it has scientific concern, studying the existing and novel chemicals available in market along with eco-friendly bioagents will have greater significance in managing economic rice disease</b>  <b>Yes</b>  Abstract is comprehensive, however there is a lack of suggestive conclusion, which is most important is missing. Suggested to rephrase the abstract <b>Manuscript structured well with minor rephrasing of sentences</b>  <b>The work carried was scientifically correct. Still some more clarifications are required regarding compatibility test of fungicides and different bioagents (mentioned in comments section)</b>  <b>No, still needed reference especially in introduction and discussion part. Even in methodology section also needed some reference relevant section</b>  <b>Discussion part is needed more structured and interconnected rather than giving general statements</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, English quality is overall good with little modifications	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I have mentioned comments in manuscripts marking with specific section, please read carefully and add missing ones / modify accordingly. Finalize the manuscript by addressing all those 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)
<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>Darshan K</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>ICFRE – Tropical Forest Research Institute, India</b>