

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_113172
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the In Vitro Impact of Native Mycoflora on the Radial Growth of Rhizoctonia solani, the Causative Agent of Root Rot Disease in Chilli
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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>Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to address important issues related to chili pepper production, disease management, and the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices, addressing the challenges posed by conventional methods while promoting the health and productivity of chili pepper crops</p> <p>The proposed title, "Exploring the In Vitro Impact of Native Mycoflora on the Radial Growth of Rhizoctonia solani, the Causative Agent of Root Rot Disease in Chilli," is generally suitable for conveying the main focus and scope of the study. However, a slight modification for clarity and conciseness could enhance the title. Here's a revised suggestion:</p> <p>"In Vitro Inhibition of Rhizoctonia solani Radial Growth by Native Mycoflora: Implications for Root Rot Disease in Chilli"</p> <p>This revision maintains the key elements of the original title while streamlining the wording for improved readability. It highlights the inhibitory action of native mycoflora on the radial growth of Rhizoctonia solani and emphasizes the relevance to root rot disease in chili peppers.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear and concise summary of the study, covering essential aspects such as the objective, methodology, key findings, and potential implications. The abstract effectively communicates the use of native bioagents from the chili rhizosphere to manage Rhizoctonia solani, the soil-borne pathogen causing root rot disease. The in vitro screening process, the identification of effective fungal and bacterial isolates, and the recorded percent inhibition of mycelial growth are all well-documented.</p> <p>Additionally, the abstract concludes with valuable insights, suggesting that a combination of Trichoderma and bacteria could be an effective and sustainable method for mitigating Rhizoctonia solani in chili crops. The endorsement of bio-control agents as an eco-friendly approach and the confirmation of Rhizoctonia solani as a causal organism add depth to the abstract. Overall, it provides a comprehensive overview of the study, making it accessible and informative for readers interested in bio-control strategies against soil-borne phytopathogens in chili crops.</p> <p>The structure appears appropriate for a scientific research paper, adhering to the standard format commonly followed in scholarly writing</p> <p>Based on the information provided in the abstract, the study seems scientifically sound. It follows a logical structure, outlines the methodology used for screening native bioagents against Rhizoctonia solani, and presents clear results indicating the effectiveness of specific fungal and bacterial isolates in inhibiting the pathogen's growth</p> <p>The references provided seem to cover a range of sources relevant to the topic of the manuscript. They include reputable sources such as FAOSTAT for global agricultural statistics, as well as scientific articles and journals related to chili pepper cultivation, seedling rot management, and the use of bio-control agents against Rhizoctonia solani. This variety of sources indicates a thorough literature review and supports the credibility of the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The text is generally clear and well-organized, making it easy for readers to follow the sequence of information	
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yusuf Hajara Oyiza
Department, University & Country	Nigeria