

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_114414
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio-efficacy of alcoholic extracts of botanicals to mitigate pea root rot caused by Fusarium solani f.sp. pisi
Type of the Article	Short 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Article of low originality</li> <li>2. The title of article suitable</li> <li>3. The summary needs to be improved even more context, objective, methods, major results</li> <li>4. The structure of the article is correct</li> <li>5. The article is scientifically correct but requires improvement. The results are insufficient (Additional analyses).</li> <li>6. Notably by updating the recent references.</li> </ol> <p>Major revision of article is necessary.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>Scientific English is in need of improvement.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>After reading the article, I would like the authors to improve the methods and add some results. The references are old for the most part. It would be wise to deepen the discussion.</p>	

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Namory Méité</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Université Félix Houphouet-Boigny, Cote D'Ivoire</b>