

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126161
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio efficacy of bioagents against <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> – An incitant of stem rot disease in groundnut.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is essential for the scientific community as it explores eco-friendly, biological alternatives to chemical fungicides for managing <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> , a significant pathogen in groundnut cultivation. It contributes valuable data on the comparative efficacy of various bioagents, which could lead to more sustainable agricultural practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides key information but requires more detail for clarity and completeness. It should briefly explain the experimental methodology, specifically the dual culture technique, and mention the type of statistical analysis used to determine the significance of the results. Additionally, the abstract lacks context regarding the importance of controlling <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> in agriculture and the potential implications of the study's findings for sustainable disease management.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, as it utilises a well-established experimental design (Completely Randomized Design) and assesses a variety of bioagents using a recognised technique (dual culture method). The statistical analysis provides credibility to the observed differences in the efficacy of the bioagents. Additionally, the selection of fungal and bacterial bioagents is appropriate for the study's goal of exploring eco-friendly methods for managing <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> . However, more detail on methodology and references to prior studies would strengthen the scientific rigor and validation of the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient, I suggest a minimum of 50 ref	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Averagely acceptable, but English editing would make it better</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction is fragmented into too many short paragraphs, making it disjointed. Combine related ideas into more cohesive paragraphs to improve flow. 2. The introduction should have a logical progression: start with the importance of <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> in groundnuts, then transition into the need for biological control methods, and finally introduce the bioagents being tested. 3. Ensure all organism names, such as <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> and <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i>, are italicised throughout the manuscript, per scientific conventions. 4. The manuscript requires thorough English editing to correct grammatical errors and improve sentence structure for better readability and flow. 5. The methodology mentioned is vague. It should specify how the bioagents were applied and the methodology used for evaluating the mycelial growth inhibition (e.g., dual culture technique, poison food technique, etc.). A brief explanation of the experimental procedure would make the abstract more informative. 6. Provide brief descriptions of the bioagents used, including their mechanisms of action, with citations to relevant studies demonstrating their efficacy in controlling <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> or other plant pathogens. 7. Replace "PDA agar" with "Potato Dextrose Agar (PDA)" in the first instance to ensure clarity. 8. Explain the in vitro evaluation using the dual culture technique with appropriate references to establish methodologies, ensuring readers understand the experimental setup. 9. improve the discussion and compare your findings with previous studies, emphasising similarities or differences. Discuss the bioagents' mechanisms of action, such as Trichoderma's mycoparasitism or Bacillus subtilis's antifungal compounds. Highlight the practical implications for sustainable agriculture, integrated pest management (IPM), and future research combining bioagents for better control. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Oluwatobi Saraah Otun</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa</p>