

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Microbiology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMB_120779</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>In vitro evaluation of fungicides against Fusarium solani causing root rot of mulberry</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	There is a real need for more research related to plant diseases, as a result of the increase in global population density, and the scarcity of food and water sources. Chemical pesticides are indispensable in maintaining plant production and providing food.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is common; please make it attractive. such as (Innovative Fungicide Techniques to Tackle <i>Fusarium solani</i> -Induced Root Rot in Mulberry)	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The knowledge gap statement is missing in the abstract. The abstract should be revised.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript lacks a hypothesis statement. Authors should include it in the introduction chapter.</li> <li>2. The objective statement in the introduction chapter needs to be revised. It lacks the scientific standard.</li> <li>3. The methodology is not in detail (Writing the source of the fungal isolate and the method of isolating it, companies producing chemical pesticides and their nationality, methods for preparing pesticide concentrations with references). Provide appropriate reference.</li> <li>4. Results</li> <li>5. The interpretation of the results is good.</li> </ol>	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The writer made an effort to complete the experiments practically, analyse them statistically, and write them smoothly for the reader	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The authors should improve their scientific writing throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>• The authors should check for grammar and typo errors.</li> </ul>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Safaa Neamat Hussein</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Mustansiriyah, Iraq</b>