

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>                                     |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJPSS_116370</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Fungal root endophyte Piriformospora indica is compatible with strobilurin fungicides</b> |
| 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p><b>01- Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community, especially those involved in plant pathology, agronomy, and agricultural biotechnology. It addresses the pressing issue of anthracnose, a significant fungal disease affecting yard long bean crops, and explores the compatibility of a beneficial root endophytic fungus, Piriformospora indica, with various fungicides commonly used for disease management. The findings shed light on potential integrated management strategies that can enhance crop protection while minimizing environmental and health risks associated with chemical fungicide usage. Moreover, the study contributes to understanding the intricate interactions between plant pathogens, beneficial microbes, and agrochemicals, paving the way for sustainable agricultural practices.</b></p> <p><b>02- The title of the article, "Fungal root endophyte Piriformospora indica is compatible with strobilurin fungicides," effectively captures the main focus of the study. However, to enhance clarity and specificity, a slightly revised title could be:</b></p> <p><b>"Compatibility of Piriformospora indica with Strobilurin Fungicides: In Vitro Assessment and Implications for Anthracnose Management in Yard Long Bean"</b></p> <p><b>03- The abstract of the article provides a comprehensive overview of the study conducted on the compatibility of the fungal root endophyte Piriformospora indica with strobilurin fungicides. It outlines the importance of P. indica in suppressing plant diseases and enhancing growth promotion. The study design and methods are described, including the use of poison food technique in petri dishes and broth media to assess compatibility, along with calculating the percentage of conidial germination.</b></p> <p><b>04 - The manuscript titled "Fungal root endophyte Piriformospora indica is compatible with strobilurin fungicides" seems to have an appropriate subsection and structure. It begins with an abstract, which succinctly summarizes the study's objectives, methods, and findings. The introduction provides background information on the topic, including the importance of Piriformospora indica in plant disease management and the challenges posed by fungal diseases in yard long beans. It also discusses the current methods of disease management and the potential of biocontrol agents like P. indica. The materials and methods section outlines the procedures followed in the study, including the maintenance and multiplication of P. indica, the compatibility assay with various fungicides, and the statistical analysis conducted. This section provides clear and detailed instructions on how the experiments were carried out, ensuring reproducibility.</b></p> <p><b>The results section presents the findings of the compatibility assay, including the effects of different fungicides on the growth and germination of P. indica. The data are presented in tables and figures, making it easy to interpret the results. The discussion section interprets the results in the context of previous research and provides insights into the compatibility of different fungicides with P. indica.</b></p> <p><b>Overall, the manuscript appears well-structured, with logical flow from introduction to discussion. Each section is appropriately detailed, and the use of tables and figures enhances the presentation of the results.</b></p> <p><b>05- Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound. It follows a systematic approach to investigate the compatibility of various fungicides with</b></p> |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>Piriformospora indica, an endophytic fungus, using both in vitro assays and spore germination studies. The methods are well-described, and the results are presented clearly, including statistical analysis to support the findings.</p> <p>06 - The references provided in the manuscript seem sufficient to support the research and provide context for the study. They cover relevant literature on fungicides, Piriformospora indica, and related topics. However, without specific information on the references included, it's challenging to determine their recency and relevance to the current state of the field.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   | <p>NA</p>   |  |

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                             |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Name:                            | Satish Pandurangji Rewatkar |
| Department, University & Country | India                       |