

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104679
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on management of pomegranate wilt (<i>Ceratocystis fimbriata</i>) with bioagents enhanced defensive capacity in plants
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>)

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>Yes It's, this research is important to provide alternative methods of handling wilt disease in pomegranate plants</p> <p>No, the title doesn't suitable. It is better to complete with the research location</p> <p>Yes, it's, Abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>Yes, they're, the subsections and the structure of the text are correct</p> <p>Yes, I do, I think the text is scientifically correct.</p> <p>No, I'am not . The library used is old, but the literature on this subject tends to be limited</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it's</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1) This research is good, but it still uses old data as the reason for the importance of this research, it needs the latest data to show the importance of this research. 2)The need for a clear formulation of research objectives. 3) On Method: need to be equipped with location, materials and tools, size/age of plants, origin of plants used, duration of researc. 4) It is better to use the T1-T6 code for the results and discussion</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aditya Irawan
Department, University & Country	Mulawarman University, Indonesia