

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126516
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro efficacy of Trichoderma harzianum nanoparticles against Colletotrichum capsici causing fruit rot of chilli
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

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>
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.	The topic selected by the author is significant and can add to the existing knowledge in the biocontrol research and sustainable agricultural practices, if carried out in a proper systematic way. The current study is just an invitro study, further field study is necessary to confirm the biocontrol potential of nanoparticles.	
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.	It is comprehensive, but there is an error in mentioning the nanoparticle concentrations used. The concentrations of NPs were given as 100, 250 and 100 ppm instead of 100, 250 and 500 ppm.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There are only few subsections. The manuscript itself is too short, not explaining the exact procedures used in nanoparticle preparation and the experimental design. It could have been more elaborate so that others can reproduce the work.	
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.	Not satisfactory with the scientific correctness. In materials and methods section, the calculation of percentage inhibition is given, but the calculated values are not mentioned anywhere in results or conclusion. Don't understand how the mycelial growth is measured, because there is almost complete growth in all the plates shown in Plate 1. Only the zone of inhibition differs for each plate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Only few references, including very old reference are used. More recent references can be used.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are a few spelling and grammatical errors. For example, in the introduction, the word Chilli is misspelt.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research study for this manuscript is based on a single experiment and no informations on nanoparticle preparation is given. It is just an invitro study and further research is required to contribute something to the research field. There are no explanations for why Trichoderma nanoparticles are more effective than fungal filtrate and why copper nanoparticles are more effective than others. In the discussion part also, the author has just compared their results with previous work. There are no scientific facts given. 	

Review Form 3

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:	K. Sabina
Department, University & Country	University of Madras, India