

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_118562
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of Fennel Varieties/Germplasm against Fusarium solani and Meloidogyne javanica
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- Yes, the manuscript on screening fennel varieties/germplasm against Fusarium solani and Meloidogyne javanica is important for the scientific community. It provides valuable information on the resistance levels of different fennel varieties to these common pathogens, which can help in developing strategies for disease management in fennel cultivation. The study design, methodology, and results presented in the manuscript contribute to the understanding of plant-pathogen interactions and can guide future research in breeding for disease-resistant fennel varieties.</p> <p>2- The title of the article, "Screening of Fennel Varieties/Germplasm against Fusarium solani and Meloidogyne javanica," is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and purpose of the study. It clearly indicates the focus on screening fennel varieties for resistance against specific pathogens. No alternative title is necessary as the current title is descriptive and informative.</p> <p>3- Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the aims, study design, place and duration of the study, methodology, results, and conclusion of the research. The abstract effectively summarizes the key findings of the study regarding the resistance levels of different fennel varieties to Fusarium solani and Meloidogyne javanica.</p> <p>4- Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized with clear sections such as Abstract, Introduction, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. Each section addresses specific aspects of the study, providing a logical flow of information from the research objectives to the findings and conclusions. The subsections within the Material and Methods section also outline the experimental design and procedures in a structured manner. Overall, the manuscript follows a standard scientific format, making it easy to navigate and understand the research conducted.</p> <p>5- ok</p> <p>6- The sources presented in the abstract are related to the study and cover a range of topics related to nematode resistance and disease incidence in fennel. However, the number of sources is very small and should be at least 20 sources.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>1- The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. The abstract provides a clear overview of the study, including its aims, methodology, results, and conclusions. The information is presented in a concise and organized manner. However, there are some minor grammatical errors and inconsistencies in punctuation that could be improved upon for better clarity. Overall, with some minor editing and proofreading, the article would be more polished and suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mojtaba Esmailpour Roshan
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University of Garmsar, Iran