

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_124451
Title of the Manuscript:	Biological Suppression of <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> in Groundnut Cultivation: A Path Towards Sustainable Disease Management
Type of the Article	Research Article

#### 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)
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.	This study aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of biocontrol agents, both individually and in combination, against the pathogen in vitro and under glasshouse conditions. Results showed that microbial consortia were more effective than individual bioagents in reducing disease incidence. Seed treatments with consortia MC1, MC2, MC3, and MC4 resulted in lower disease incidences of 13.80%, 16.01%, 20.0%, and 22.60%, respectively, compared to 74.12% in the pathogen control. Additionally, these treatments promoted plant growth under glasshouse conditions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable for the research. In the title, the name of the microorganism ( <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> ) should be italicized and not in bold form to follow the proper scientific naming conventions.	
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.	Abstract of the research article is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate	
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.	In the Material and Methods section, the term "Chrome Azurol Succinate (CAS)" is incorrect. It should be revised to "Chrome Azurol S dye." The correction reflects the proper name of the dye used in assays to detect siderophore production. The term "succinate" is a misunderstanding, as Chrome Azurol S is a dye specifically used for the CAS assay, which stands for Chrome Azurol S, not "Succinate." This change ensures the accuracy of the experimental description and aligns with standard terminology in microbiological research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	More recent references needed	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments		

**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>Ravindra Raosaheb Rakh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shri Guru Buddhiswami Mahavidyalaya, India</b>