

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125343
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation, Purification, Identification and Pathogenicity of Sclerotium rolfsii (Sacc.) Caused by Collar Rot of Chickpea
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 3](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses collar rot in chickpea, a crucial crop for food security. But this disease in chickpea is a very common issue, and numerous advanced studies have already been conducted on this topic. Therefore, it is essential to clearly state the aims and research gaps in both the introduction and the abstract and highlight the outcome in conclusion part to demonstrate the impact of this research.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title clearly reflects the scope of the study. It includes the key processes of the study (isolation, purification, identification, and pathogenicity) and specifies both the pathogen (<i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i>) and the host (chickpea).</p> <p>However, the title could be slightly refined for clarity and brevity. Consider rephrasing it to:</p> <p><b>"Isolation, Identification, and Pathogenicity of <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> Causing Collar Rot in Chickpea."</b></p> <p>This version maintains all the essential components but is more concise. It also shifts the focus directly to the causal relationship between the pathogen and the disease in chickpeas. The term "purification" is often understood as part of the isolation process, so it may not need to be explicitly stated unless it has a special significance in the study.</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is generally appropriate for the study, as it covers the major aspects like isolation, identification, pathogenicity testing, and results regarding disease incidence and seed germination. If possible, please add a line that summarizes the key findings or the significance of the study.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections in the materials and methods, as well as the results, are quite repetitive and need thorough revision. Please write the <b>Materials and Methods</b> section clearly, providing proper references, and present the detailed <b>Results</b> in the following section. Ensure that these sections are distinct and avoid mixing them.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>Morphological methods for identifying <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> have limitations and are often inadequate for precise species-level identification. Morphological traits, such as sclerotia size and mycelium appearance, can overlap with other species, leading to potential misidentification, particularly with closely related fungi like <i>Sclerotium delphinii</i>. Furthermore, molecular studies have revealed cryptic species within <i>S. rolfsii</i>, which cannot be distinguished based solely on morphology. Therefore, molecular identification methods, such as ITS rDNA sequencing, are essential to ensure precise differentiation, as they provide genetic clarity that morphology alone cannot offer.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. There is no issue regarding the references.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	There are some small grammatical mistakes in certain places. Please check the grammar and rewrite the sentence accordingly.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Scientific names should be written in italics, and there are spacing issues in some places. Please correct them.	

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tanushree Sarkar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, India</b>