

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_117205
Title of the Manuscript:	Biopotential of cyanobacteria, fulvic acid and nanochitosan in controlling leaf rust of wheat
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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, this manuscript is important for scientific society as it investigates the antifungal efficacy of cyanobacteria (<i>Spirulina platensis</i>, <i>Nostoc calcicole</i>), fulvic acid and chitosan nanoparticles against wheat leaf rust. It also determines the histopathologic defense mechanisms involved disease control.</p> <p>Yes, title of the article is suitable for the current study.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, all the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>All the references are sufficient. Some recent advances (2024) are advised to be added in the manuscript.</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>Yes, quality of the articles is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. Quality of Figure 1 needs to be improved.</p> <p>2. Too many details are given for some methods in Materials and Methods. Authors are advised to write the experimental method in brief and cite the suitable reference. If any experiment is conducted with modifications in the existing method, give details of such changes/ modifications.</p> <p>3. Reference format is not same in the manuscript. Use same format throughout the manuscript.</p>	

Comment [DYL1]:

[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>Yogita Lugani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>