

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105023
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on anti-fungal activity of different macro algal extracts against soil borne pathogen Sclerotium rolfsii Sacc.
Type of the 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1.Yes, particularly <i>Sclerotium rolfsiis</i> is the most destructive soil borne fungus. it can cause several types of damage such as damping-off, crown, and root rot as well as dry rot canker in older plants, in addition it has ability to persist in the soil for several years. In facing this challenge seaweed extracts can offer protection against such plant diseases.</p> <p>2.Yes.</p> <p>3.No, it is better to rewrite the abstract to include inhibition of fungal growth% instead of mycelial growth (cm) or both of them, and inhibition% of methanol extracts in comparison with those of aqueous and chloroform extracts.</p> <p>4.Yes.</p> <p>5.Yes.</p> <p>6.Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1.Yes. Good research work, but: -add extracts to keywords -each result is mean of three replications therefore it is more accurate to list your results values in form of (mean±SD) for n=3. -it is better to combine your tables with their charts and their images of petri dishes, because figures of results charts are rapid and easiest to understand. -add percent inhibition of fungal growth to table 5 to make reader rapidly recognize the high antifungal activity of methanol extracts in comparison with aqueous and chloroform extracts.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I suggest you to add two good references of:</p> <p>1- Selma Mabrouki, Fatima Lakhdar, "In Vitro Antifungal Activity of Seaweed Extracts Against <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i>: A Causal Agent of Root Rot Disease on Sugar beet (<i>Beta vulgaris</i> L.)", Int. J. Pharm. Sci. Rev. Res., 63(2), July - August 2020; Article No. 14, Pages: 90-97.</p> <p>2- Latifeh Pourakbar, Sina Siavash Moghaddam, "Antifungal Activity of the Extract of a Macroalgae, <i>Gracilariaopsis persica</i>, against Four Plant Pathogenic Fungi", Plants (Basel). 2021 Sep; 10(9): 1781.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suhair M. Yaseen
Department, University & Country	Middle Technical University, Iraq