

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_114239
Title of the Manuscript:	Prospecting efficacy of native bacterial bioagents against blast disease and their potential for plant growth promotion in finger millet.
Type of the Article	Research 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? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1-This manuscript holds significance for several reasons. Firstly, it explores the potential use of native biocontrol agents to combat finger millet blast disease. This eco-friendly approach aligns with the growing interest in sustainable and environmentally friendly agricultural practices. Secondly, the study identifies two specific bacterial isolates, <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> and <i>Bacillus subtilis</i>, demonstrating promising antifungal activity and plant growth-promoting properties. If further research validates their effectiveness under field conditions, these isolates could offer a valuable alternative to chemical fungicides for finger millet farmers. Additionally, the research contributes to the broader understanding of microbial communities influencing plant health and disease management, paving the way for potential advancements in sustainable agricultural practices.</p> <p>2-Yes, the title of the article is suitable</p> <p>3- Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive</p> <p>4- Manuscript structure seems good overall. However, I suggested adding clearer headings in the discussion section and potentially replacing some paragraphs for improved clarity.</p> <p>5-The manuscript appears scientifically sound</p> <p>6- The references appear comprehensive and up-to-date, covering relevant and recent literature in the field</p> <p>But</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 listed not cited: Fix citations or remove references (Vidhyasekaran 1997, Viswanath 1997, Shanmugapackiam et al. 2021, Radjacommare et al. 2004, Mendels & reeses T 1957). • 2 cited not listed: Add missing references (Vidhyasekharan et al. 1997, Vishwanath et al. 1997). <p>suggestion of additional references:</p> <p>-Tharana Poonacha T., C.H. Sai Bhavana, Farooqkhan, G.V. Ramesh, Netravati Gavayi, Prasanna S. Koti, K.B. Palanna, H. Rajashekara, G. Rajesh and I.K. Das. 2023. Blast Disease of Millets: Present Status and Future Perspectives. https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/87016. DOI: 10.5772/intechopen.111392</p> <p>- Mageshwaran, V., Paulraj, S., Nagaraju, Y. (2023). Current Insights into the Role of Rhizosphere Bacteria in Disease Suppression in Millets. In: Pudake, R.N., Kumari, M., Sapkal, D.R., Sharma, A.K. (eds) Millet Rhizosphere . Rhizosphere Biology. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-2166-9_6</p> <p>7- In reviewing the conclusion section, I noticed that there might be an opportunity to further integrate the findings from the cited references. While the existing summary provides a good overview, potentially combining and summarizing the key takeaways from these references could strengthen the conclusiveness and impact of this section.</p> <p>8- I noticed the discussion section is quite lengthy. To enhance readability and help readers navigate the various points discussed, I would suggest incorporating headings for each key idea. This would allow readers to quickly identify the specific topics being addressed and facilitate easier comprehension, especially for a lengthy discussion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>I've identified some minor errors in the text. Please take a look and revise them as needed.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the article is appropriate for scholarly publications.	
Optional/General comments	<p>- While the manuscript focuses on the environmental benefits of using biocontrol agents, including a brief economic analysis comparing the cost-effectiveness of these isolates with traditional fungicides could provide valuable information for farmers.</p> <p>- It's important to remember that even though these points highlight potential areas for improvement, it doesn't diminish the overall value of the manuscript. Constructive criticism should always be offered in a professional and respectful manner, focusing on the potential for further enhancing the research</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nisreen Alsaoud
Department, University & Country	Al- Baath University, Syria