

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_112238
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of rice sheath blight disease in Cauvery command area of Karnataka
Type of the 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important to scientific community especially researchers in Karnataka regions with the survey information of <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> Kuhn. 2. The title was suitable for the research. 3. The abstract is comprehensive and cover the ideas and findings of the research. 4. Overall structure is appropriate. 5. This manuscript lacks sufficient statistical test to identify highest and lowest prevalence of the rice sheath blight disease. Thus, the manuscript is not scientifically correct. I strongly suggest adding statistical analysis such as T-test, AVONA, or other pair test. In the discussion part, when compared to Prasad <i>et al.</i> (2011), I suggested add more context of those locations. It might be good to add to the map in Fig. 1. 6. As the nature of the plant pathology, these references are sufficient and recent. 7. Additional recommendations, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. In the future, please add line number so the revision will be easier. b. In the introduction, separate "Among biotic stresses, ..." into another paragraph. c. In the method, add appropriate statistical tests. d. In results, check the paragraph 4 and 5 with the format. e. In the last paragraph of the results, explain more on channel and borewell that they are irrigation system ecosystem. And be consistent with upper or lower case of the text. Add more context to compare with Prasad <i>et al.</i> (2011). f. Table 2, add standard error column and organise the table. g. Fig 1, explain in the text that the highlighted areas are the area of study. h. Fig 2, add standard error bars. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Overall English is acceptable for publication with some minor revisions needed. For example, the full names of all abbreviations like SES, and PDI. Some missing commas make this article hard to read. Please carefully revise.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kittikun Songsomboon
Department, University & Country	The University of Technology, Australia