

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_110924</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Management of Early Blight of tomato (<i>Alternaria solani</i>) through application of plant extracts and fungicides</b>
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1- The work is important for scientific community</p> <p>2- Yes, the title is suitable</p> <p>3- the abstract is not clear, I recommend rewriting the abstract, so as to provide a quick overview of the key points of the study, allowing readers to understand the purpose, methods, results and conclusions. In this summary, we cannot get an idea of the methods used to achieve the objective of the study.</p> <p>4- It is best to keep the discussion separate from the results</p> <p>5- Yes, even if it's better use some statistics to evaluate the obtained results</p> <p>6- I recommend looking for some new references in the field</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1- yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Major revisions :</b></p> <p>“Consider rewriting the abstract, developing the discussion in order to better explain the obtained results and compare them with the previously published studies in the field.</p> <p>There is also a need to use statistical analysis, some result may be due to the hazard only and could have no scientific significance</p> <p>Highlight the originality and the added value of the work”</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zineb Choukairi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Morocco</b>