

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>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>Yes, Powdery mildew diseases in different plants cause a great loss to the Agriculturist and horticulturist. Control it by using biological methods will protect us from the harmful effects of chemicals. This research is important from a scientific point of view.</p> <p>I think It should be “Evaluation of Plant Extracts, Bioagents, and Chemical Fungicides in Vitro against Powdery Mildew of Pea” better than the provided title.</p> <p>No. The Abstract is not in the correct format as given in the guidelines (Template). The background, methodology, and conclusion are not clear. Citation in the Abstract?</p> <p>No. The structure and the subsection are not as mentioned in the template., All the structure is small letters not capitalized and the font style is in Times Roman? the colon(:) and the dash(-) in the subsection and section are not needed in the article. So, strictly follow the guidelines while preparing the manuscript.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>No. additional and recent references are required. References are not cited properly in the</p> <p>Major and serious revision of the manuscript is necessary. Follow the guidelines while preparing. The citation is very weak. Must improve in all the sections of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. Has to work hard to maintain the quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Major and serious revision is required.</p> <p>Abstract ..The efficacy of bioagents was evaluated by preparing the bacterial and fungal culture filtrates (Hassan and Eman.,2017), why citation, no background, very short methodology, and no conclusion'</p> <p>Introduction: only one citation? The introduction part lacks the objectives, only about fungicide in introduction ?</p> <p>Materials and Methods: not clear</p> <p>Results and Discussion: only result is written no Discussion ?</p> <p>Conclusion only the results is highlighted?</p> <p>References and citation Not properly cited .</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:	Ganga Gharty Chhetri
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal