

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	JournalofScientificResearchandReports
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JSRR_126516
TitleoftheManuscript:	InvitroefficacyofTrichodermaharzianumanoparticlesagainstColletotrichumcapsicicausingfruit rotofchilli
TypeoftheArticle	Researcharticle

PART1: ReviewComments

CompulsoryREVISIONcomments	Reviewer'scomment	Author'sFeedback(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpart inthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of sentences may be required for this part.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">you like 3-4</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the antifungal potential of biosynthesized nanoparticles from <i>Trichodermaharzianum</i>, particularly in managing the anthracnose disease in chili caused by <i>Colletotrichumcapsici</i>. The research highlights copper nanoparticles (CuNPs) as the most effective, with significant inhibition of fungal growth compared to silver and zinc nanoparticles. This work is important for the scientific community as it demonstrates an eco-friendly approach to plant disease management using biocontrol agents, supporting the shift away from chemical pesticides towards sustainable agriculture practices. I appreciate the study's rigorous approach to exploring green nanotechnology, which could have practical applications in crop protection, though it could benefit from additional field trials to confirm its effectiveness beyond the laboratory setting.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title, "<i>InvitroefficacyofTrichodermaharzianumanoparticlesagainstColletotrichumcapsici causingfruitrotofchilli</i>," is informative but could be made more concise and impactful. A more suitable title might be: "Antifungal Efficacy of Trichodermaharzianum-Derived Nanoparticles Against Colletotrichum capsici in Chili"</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a solid overview of the study, including the methodology, key findings, and implications. However, it could be improved with a few additions and refinements for better clarity and completeness:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify Objective: Begin with a clear statement of the study's purpose, such as "<i>This study evaluates the antifungal effectiveness of biosynthesized Trichodermaharzianum nanoparticles against Colletotrichumcapsici, the pathogen responsible for anthracnose in chili crops.</i>" Experimental Conditions: Briefly mention the concentration tested (100, 250, and 500 ppm) to give readers a quick insight into the scope of the testing conditions. Comparative Analysis: Although the abstract mentions that CuNP was the most effective, it would be helpful to include a short comparison, noting that CuNP showed the highest zone of inhibition, followed by AgNP and ZnNP, to highlight the relative efficacy. Conclusion and Implications: Add a concluding sentence on the significance of the findings for 	

ReviewForm3

<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure appears generally appropriate, as it follows a standard scientific layout with sections like <i>Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion</i>. This structure is effective for presenting experimental research. However, a few structural adjustments could improve readability and flow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Separate Results and Discussion: If possible, separating <i>Results</i> and <i>Discussion</i> into distinct sections could help readers differentiate between raw findings and their interpretation. This separation would allow a more focused discussion on the implications and comparisons with previous studies.2. Clarify Subsections in Methods: In the <i>Materials and Methods</i> section, subsections on sample preparation, concentration levels, and measurement techniques (e.g., Agarwell method) could enhance clarity. This would make it easier for readers to follow specific aspects of the experimental design.3. Enhanced Visual Presentation of Data: The tables and figures, such as those detailing inhibition zones and mycelial growth, are well-placed. However, adding brief descriptions or interpretations directly below each figure or table could enhance reader understanding without needing to cross-reference extensively with the text.4. Expand Conclusion: The conclusion could be expanded slightly to summarize key findings and suggest areas for future research, particularly in field applications of the nanoparticles.	
--	--	--

ReviewForm3

<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-defined methodology and detailed experimental design. The use of biosynthesized nanoparticles and the Agar well method for evaluating antifungal efficacy are appropriate for assessing <i>in vitro</i> inhibition of <i>Colletotrichum capsici</i>. The concentrations and types of nanoparticles tested are varied and relevant, allowing for a clear comparison of efficacy across different metals, which strengthens the validity of the findings. Additionally, the data presented in tables and figures, such as inhibition zones and mycelial growth rates, are comprehensive and allow for a thorough interpretation of results. Overall, the manuscript demonstrates careful control and measurement, providing a solid basis for its conclusions on the biocontrol potential of copper nanoparticles.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The manuscript includes a range of references relevant to the study, particularly focusing on previous research on antifungal nanoparticles and their use in agriculture. However, there could be a few improvements to ensure a more comprehensive and recent literature foundation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recency of References: While some recent studies (e.g., from 2023 and 2024) are cited, many references date back several years. Including more recent studies on nanoparticle-based biocontrol and advancements in green synthesis methods from the last 2-3 years would strengthen the manuscript's context. Additional Studies on Copper Nanoparticles in Agriculture: Since copper nanoparticles (CuNPs) were particularly effective, including recent studies specifically addressing their use in other crops or pathogens would add depth to the discussion. For example, recent research on CuNPs in 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are a few areas where it could be improved for clarity and readability:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar and Syntax: Some sentences could be refined for smoother flow. For instance, in the abstract, sentences like "All three nanoparticles tested at 100, 250 and 500 ppm were significant in recording minimum mycelial growth..." could be rephrased to improve clarity, such as "All three nanoparticles tested showed significant inhibition of mycelial growth at concentrations of 100, 250, and 500 ppm." Consistency in Terminology: Ensure consistent use of terms (e.g., "Trichoderma harzianum-derived nanoparticles" instead of alternating with variations) to avoid confusion. Conciseness: Some sections could benefit from concise rephrasing to avoid redundancy, making the text easier to follow. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the antifungal potential of <i>Trichoderma harzianum</i>-derived nanoparticles against <i>Colletotrichum capsici</i>, a significant pathogen in chili cultivation. The experimental design, including varied nanoparticle concentrations and the use of the Agar well method, is sound and supports the study's findings, particularly regarding the efficacy of copper nanoparticles. While the structure and methodology are well-organized, improvements in language clarity and recent references could strengthen the paper's scholarly quality and contextual relevance. Overall, this study is a noteworthy contribution to sustainable agricultural practices, offering an eco-friendly alternative for disease management in crops.</p>	

ReviewForm3

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:	Mayur Arun Dongre
Department, University & Country	Shri Shivaji Vidya Prasarak Sanstha's Late Karmaveer Dr. P. R. Ghogrey Science College, Kavayitri Bahinabai Chaudhari North Maharashtra University, India