

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124524
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> and organic amendments against black root rot disease caused by <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> in strawberry (<i>Fragaria x ananassa</i> Duch.)
Type of the Article	Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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.	The aim of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of organic amendments, PGPR and botanical treatment for the management of <i>R. solani</i> , an important disease agent of strawberry. For this purpose, different combinations of FYM, vermicompost, biomix compost, neem cake, cocopeat and botanical neem leaf extract were used as soil amendment and <i>P. fluorescens</i> root treatment. In the end, it was evaluated which combination had a better effect on the plant. The importance of this article is to try to determine a kind of biological control formula created in order to prevent this disease, which causes a significant yield loss during strawberry cultivation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive enough for this article	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In my opinion, in the results and discussion section, it may be less subsections. It will be easier to evaluate the results if the data on fruit and leafing measurements are given separately under a single subheading.	
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.	There are some parts that need to be corrected in the article. First of all, it would be more meaningful to evaluate the data of the article if it is explained why the ingredients in the applied formulations are used in these ratios. In the results and discussion section, there have been repetitive concluding remarks in different subsections. Since the T7 formulation gives the most significant result in all data sets, the same sentences are used to explain how the components within this formulation affect different parameters. By combining several sub-headings, the impact of the T7 formulation on these parameters can be explained in a common way.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Betul Aydin
Department, University & Country	Gazi University, Turkiye