

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_112190
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of new fungicides against sheath blight of rice under field conditions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, rice is one of the most important crops over the world including India and sheath blight disease of rice is currently destructive disease of the crop in many countries where rice is growing. Thus, scientists or researchers can be using the experimental improved management methods as to do further research works.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is somewhat need modification. May be I suggest an alternative title of 'Evaluation/effect of chemical fungicides against sheath blight disease of rice in India'.</p> <p>3. No, in the abstract, the objective (purpose of the study) and conclusions of the study didn't included and also the main findings of the study should be rearranged and explained briefly.</p> <p>4. No, in materials and methods, it needs rearrangement and one paragraph mentioned in result session should be taken to the session of materials and methods. In discussion, repeated statements which were mentioned in the result should be deleted and rearranged. Treatment assignment with naming of T1, T2, T3... is not necessary should be deleted in whole sessions no need of repeating. One very important disease parameter that is disease incidence data was missed in this manuscript should be incorporated and discussed. Moreover, data analysis part was missed in the session of materials and methods.</p> <p>5. No, title, abstract, introduction, materials and methods, discussion and conclusions should be scientifically corrected.</p> <p>6. No, the mentioned references in the manuscript are not sufficient enough and recent, especially on introduction and materials and methods sessions. And also, authors didn't follow the Journal's style. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets. Thus, the authors should be checked again the reference style of the journal.</p> <p>Additional suggestions/comments: Authors should follow the Journal's style in all sessions and I also suggest as incorporating Acknowledgement and Competing interests parts to the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, somehow, but I have tried to correct some grammatical error and statements which were ambiguous. However, authors should be made further improvement in versions of the modified manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The written manuscript article was good as first draft sent for review and if further improvements made based on the given comments/suggestions of reviewers I hope the manuscript will be scientifically communicable and very important because the experiment was done on the important crop and disease in India.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Ano Wariyo Negesso
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia