

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_113263
Title of the Manuscript:	"Evaluation of the most effective plant extracts, bioagents and chemical fungicides in vitro against powdery mildew of pea."
Type of the Article	Short 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This study provides valuable insights into several plant extracts that hold potential as bioagents for controlling fungal growth. The findings offer significant information on the effectiveness of these extracts in inhibiting fungal proliferation, highlighting their potential applications in agriculture and beyond.</li> <li>2. Suitable</li> <li>3. The abstract of this article is sufficiently comprehensive in presenting information related to the methods, but the correction of scientific species name format needed.</li> <li>4. It's OK</li> <li>5. The article is scientifically correct, however, the (Methods section) requires a more detailed elaboration, especially in the isolation procedure of plant extract. Additionally, there is a need for improvement in sentence structure, particularly in the use of citation numbers at the beginning of sentences, and the placement of the analysis methods which seem to be misplaced (Result and Discussion section)</li> <li>6. References, there are several citations are not in accordance with standard bibliography writing guidelines.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	The quality of the English-language article is suitable for scholarly communication	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alimuddin Ali</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia</b>