

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125861
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bio-efficacy of Biochar's against Fusarium oxysporum f.sp. radicis-cucumerinum inciting Root and Stem Rot Disease of Cucumber in In vitro condition</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>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.</p>	<p>- The manuscript tests the in vitro bioefficacy of three different biochars (biochar with a high carbon concentration, highly stable and resistant to biological decomposition). This product may be effective in controlling an agricultural pest, <i>F. oxysporum</i> f.sp. <i>radicis-cucumerinum</i>, which causes root and stem rot in cucumber.</p> <p>The manuscript has scientific relevance, as the authors carried out all stages of the investigation correctly. The manuscript is also relevant for increasing soil fertility and agricultural productivity.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>- Yes! The title of the article is appropriate.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>- Although the abstract is quite brief, it is appropriate.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>- Yes, the subsections and the structure of the manuscript are all appropriate in the text.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>- The authors followed all the procedures for preparing a scientific article. With an Introduction to the problem, a robust methodology for this type of research, the results are presented in the form of a table and figure. The discussion and conclusion are robust. The references are not up to date, with only 18% being less than 10 years old.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>- No! The references are not sufficient, and only 18% of them are less than 10 years old.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript addresses a highly relevant topic, which is the use of biochar in the control of agricultural pests and soil fertility. This product can be effective in controlling an agricultural pest, <i>F. oxysporum</i> f.sp. <i>radicis-cucumerinum</i>, which causes root and stem rot in cucumber. The manuscript has scientific, environmental and food production relevance. However, the references are out of date, with only 18% being less than 10 years old. I suggest that the authors update the references for a <b>new round</b>.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Guido Laercio Braganca Castagnino</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Bahia, Brazil</b>