

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127865
Title of the Manuscript:	Biocontrol mechanism of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal fungi against plant-parasitic nematodes : A review
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study highlights the potential of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi as eco-friendly alternatives to chemical nematicides. 2. By exploring the symbiotic relationship between fungi and plants, this research advances our understanding of natural biocontrol mechanisms. 3. The findings contribute to the scientific community's efforts to promote sustainable agricultural practices. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is okay, but please fix the spelling mistake that has been made in mycorrhizal fungi.	
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>The abstract is comprehensive and effectively conveys the key aspects of the study. Here are some suggestions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simplify the introductory sentence by combining overlapping ideas. 2. Clarify the focus of the review. 3. The abstract repeats terms like "AMF" and "PPN" without variations. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Introducing synonyms or restructuring sentences can enhance readability.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript would benefit from minor revisions for conciseness and clarity, particularly by streamlining repetitive ideas and ensuring the mechanisms are explained in a more reader-friendly manner.	

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:	Mohammad Hashim
Department, University & Country	Mohammad Ali Jauhar University, India