

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104685
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of pomegranate wilt caused by Ceratocystis fimbriata Ell. and Halst
Type of the Article	Original Research

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The revised manuscript deals with an issue that worries both scientists and agricultural producers. In this case, it is a disease of very valuable crop - pomegranate. Authors look at the bio-intensive disease management strategy as a way to control wilt disease effectively and give the encouraging results.</p> <p>2. Everything is quite wright with the title of the article.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>5. The the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are not recent. The research results are from 2014-2015 years and the references end by 2015 year. There are not references during last 5 years. For example: Shruthi TH et all. Isolation and bioefficacy screening of native <i>Trichoderma</i> species as a potential biocontrol agents against pomegranate wilt caused by Ceratocystis fimbriata Ellis and Halts. J.Pharmacogn.Phytoche. 2019, 8(5)^ 1581-1585. Kishor Chand Kumhar et all. Can Genus Trichgoderma Manage Plant Diseases under Organic Agricultura from the edited volume Trichoderma edited by F.C.Juliatti, 2022. DOI: 10.5772/intechopen.103762</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of English language of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript will be suitable for publication after adding of the current references information.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tatsiana Savitskaya
Department, University & Country	Belarusian State University, Belarus