

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_120442
Title of the Manuscript:	Inhibitory potential of certain fungicides on <i>Pyricularia oryzae</i> Cavara
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant to the scientific community as it addresses the critical issue of fungicide resistance in rice blast management. This problem poses a substantial threat to global rice production. By evaluating alternative fungicides, the study provides valuable insights into adequate substitutes for tricyclazole, which has been banned due to resistance and residue concerns.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Inhibitory Potential of Certain Fungicides on Pyricularia oryzae Cavara" is clear and descriptive, accurately reflecting the manuscript's content. However, it could be made more specific to highlight the context and significance of the study. Here is a suggested alternative title:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"Evaluating Alternative Fungicides for Effective Management of Rice Blast Disease: Inhibitory Effects on Pyricularia oryzae Cavara"</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The article's abstract is comprehensive, covering the critical aspects of the study, including the problem addressed, the methodology, and the main findings. However, a few refinements can enhance clarity and completeness:</p> <p>Methodology: Highlight the specific experimental methods used to assess fungicide efficacy (e.g., in vitro assays, and field trials). Results Specificity: Specify how the efficacy was measured (e.g., percentage of pathogen inhibition). Implications: Indicate the practical applications of the findings for farmers and researchers.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it employs a comprehensive and methodical approach to evaluating the efficacy of various fungicides against Pyricularia oryzae. The use of multiple dosage levels provides a thorough understanding of each fungicide's effectiveness, ensuring that the conclusions drawn are well-supported by the data.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>⋮</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simplify or briefly explain terms like "hemi-biotrophic recalcitrant fungus" to ensure clarity for all readers. 2. Expand on why tricyclazole, carbendazim, and mancozeb lead to resistance, including specific mechanisms or examples. 3. Provide more details on the limitations of biological control methods and the unknown aspects of plant-based extracts' efficacy. <p>Methodology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include more detail about the statistical methods used. Explain the rationale behind the Box-Cox transformation and its relevance to the analysis, and provide information on how the one-way ANOVA and Duncan's Multiple Range Test were applied to the data. <p>Result and Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specify whether the differences in inhibition rates, especially for tebuconazole compared to other fungicides, are statistically significant and provide relevant p-values if available. 2. Briefly address potential sources of error or anomalies in the results, particularly for fungicides with lower inhibition rates like picoxystrobin and kresoxim-methyl. 3. Address why picoxystrobin and kresoxim-methyl showed decreased efficacy at lower concentrations compared to their reported effectiveness in other studies. Provide possible explanations or hypotheses for these discrepancies. 4. Integrate more details from previous studies that align with or contradict the findings of this study, and explain how the current results compare with these studies beyond just citing them. This will provide a more precise context for the significance of your findings. 5. Explain the practical implications of using hexaconazole and other effective fungicides in real-world rice cultivation. Discuss any potential challenges or considerations for farmers when implementing these alternatives, including cost, availability, and application practices. <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. restate the most significant findings, including the specific effectiveness of each fungicide and the implications for managing rice blast disease. This will reinforce the importance of the study's results. 2. Suggest areas for future research based on the study's findings. For instance, mention any additional tests needed for field trials or the exploration of combination treatments. 3. Highlight how the findings can be practically applied in rice cultivation. Include recommendations for farmers on integrating these alternative fungicides into their disease management strategies. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Oluwatobi Sarah Otun</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa</p>