

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_120174
Title of the Manuscript:	Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi as a control agent for angular leaf spot disease of common beans (<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Research 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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it highlights the Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi as a control agent for angular leaf spot disease of common beans (Phaseolus vulgaris L.)	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the manuscript is divided into appropriate subsections.	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	Yes. The manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Research article language is good and suitable. The parts highlighted in red in the paper need to be reframed so that they are more coherent. I have also suggested some corrections in color. After few corrections approved for publication.	
Optional/General comments	Few corrections in red marks required before publication of this article	

Review Form 1.8

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:	Kamal Prasad
Department, University & Country	India