

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_114026
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF TEBUCONAZOLE 6% FS AGAINST COLLAR ROT, STEM ROT AND ROOT ROT DISEASE COMPLEX IN GROUNDNUT
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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Absolutely! This manuscript significantly enriches the scientific community by offering valuable and ground-breaking insights. 2. The title aptly captures the essence of the article, effectively conveying its content and attracting reader interest. 3. The article's abstract covers groundnut's importance, soil-borne diseases' severity, field experiments, and Tebuconazole 6% FS seed treatment's effectiveness in preventing collar, stem, and root rot. Seed germination, disease incidence, and pod production are detailed in the abstract, which summarizes two seasons of study. 4. The manuscript's subsections and overall structure are well-organized, providing a clear and logical presentation of the research, contributing to the overall readability and understanding of the content. 5. The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with a robust methodology and well-documented results, contributing to its credibility within the scientific community. 6. The references are generally sufficient and recent, contributing to the scholarly foundation of the manuscript. However, considering the dynamic nature of scientific literature, it may be beneficial to incorporate a few additional recent references to enhance the current relevance and completeness of the bibliography. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	No	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Aqib Shafiq
Department, University & Country	Ghazi University, Pakistan