

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127160
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the biocompatibility and antifungal activity of different biopolymeric derivatives against foliar pathogens
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>

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 study studied the compatibility of biopolymeric derivatives. It also studied the antifungal activities of same. The study generated two tables and one figure.	
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.	Yes	
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 results presented on Figure 1 is duplicated on Table 2. For instance, T1 effect on <i>Phaeoisariopsis personata</i> was 83.55. The author has just picked one set of data from Table 2 and used it to plot the graph in Figure 1. The study can be broadened and flesh-up. Statistical analyses were not mentioned in the methods, but it reflects on Table 2.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	About 75 % of the references are older than 10 years.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The result from this study is too small to hold for a full research paper. The authors can add more experiments and make the study robust for a full academic paper or it could be submitted and published as a short communication.	

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:	John A. Amao
Department, University & Country	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria