

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_111897
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Disease complex of Penicellium and root knot nematode on the growth and development of chilli (Capsicum annum L.) crop
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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?</p> <p>Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>2. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>3. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>4. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>5. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. They are not enough.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It is necessary for the article to be written adequately. The title needs better wording.</p> <p>The abstract lacks a synthesized description of the objective, methodology, and results, with a brief conclusion."</p> <p>The introduction needs to be focused on describing the fundamentals of the topics presented in the article. For example: begin by describing the problem of <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> in chili plants and continue with conventional or alternative control strategies. Then, associate that one of the strategies is the use of fungi that control the nematode, such as <i>Penicillium</i> sp., and establish that the fungus does not harm the plant with various already published works, since <i>Penicillium</i> is considered a pathogenic fungus of several plants. Finally, explain how the fungus controls the nematode.</p> <p>In materials and methods, essential information for the work is missing, such as: How many nematode juveniles were placed on the plants and how many spores per mL of the fungus? How many mL were applied to the roots? How was the nutrition management of the plants and what type of irrigation was used? It should be indicated what type of manure and kitchen waste was used, and in what proportions. Also, what type of treatment was given to this material since they can be carriers of nematodes, indicate if sterilization was performed. It would be appropriate to include more information if available. The document mentions plant height but does not present the data. Describe the statistical analyses that were carried out. And properly describe and arrange the subtitles of the work.</p> <p>Statistical analyses of the results are not presented. The presentation needs to be improved and it should be made clear what the contents of the tables mean, for example, it is not understood what 'S.No, RKNs .' signifies. The discussion should be associated with the findings of this research and those of other, preferably recent (last 5 years) research. Consider not including photos that do not demonstrate differences; most of those included in the document do not reflect the research results.</p> <p>It is necessary to consult more scientific articles that can provide a foundation for the work and can be used to enrich the discussion.</p> <p>Adequately describe the conclusions that reflect the synthesis of the results and associate them concretely with the objective of the work.</p> <p>The scientific article must be written according to the writing guidelines indicated by the journal</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? It is necessary to improve English</p>		

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Guadalupe Oyoque Salcedo
Department, University & Country	National Polytechnic Institute, México