

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 | |

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>The article should definitely important and surely put a milestone for next research and scientific community. The title also suitable The abstract section needs some organization. Example The statement of problem must firstly written before objective of the current research. It also lacks The futures research direction or recommendations for next scientific community. Over all it is god if it was reorganized in this manner. The structure or subsection of the research seems good but it needs comprehensive literature review and more comparative method on discussion section. If the above mentioned comment incorporated by writer the manuscript becomes scientifically correct and good. The reference cited here is god and recent but still it need more reference citation using comprehensive literature review and compare the result and discussion section by mentioning the work related to the current task.</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>Actually the written seems good in language usage but it can be more than this if done well.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Overall the manuscript is good if all the mentioned comment is incorporated.</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: | Terfo Yilma Mikre |
| Department, University & Country | Haramaya University, Ethiopia |