

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_122579</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Antifungal potential of macro-algae against <i>Alternaria solani</i> causing early leaf blight in tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.)</b>
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 to the scientific community, particularly in the fields of agricultural science and plant pathology. It addresses a critical issue <i>Alternaria solani</i>-induced early blight in tomatoes—by exploring the potential of macro-algae as natural antifungal agents. The study's focus on <i>Kappaphycus alvarezii</i> introduces an innovative and eco-friendly approach to disease management in agriculture, which could reduce the reliance on chemical fungicides. I appreciate the manuscript's originality and potential to contribute to sustainable farming practices. However, while the research is promising, it could benefit from clearer data presentation and a more detailed discussion of the broader implications of its findings.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title of the article, "Antifungal potential of macro-algae against <i>Alternaria solani</i> causing early leaf blight in tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.)," is generally suitable as it clearly conveys the main focus of the research. However, to enhance specificity and capture the innovative aspect of the study, an alternative title could be:</p> <p>"Antifungal Efficacy of <i>Kappaphycus alvarezii</i> and Other Macro-Algae Against <i>Alternaria solani</i> Induced Early Blight in Tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.)"</p> <p>This title highlights the specific macro-algae studied, particularly <i>Kappaphycus alvarezii</i>, which appears to be central to the research findings.</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 provides a good summary but is somewhat dense. It might benefit from breaking down the results into more easily digestible points. For instance, the significant findings about <i>Kappaphycus alvarezii</i> should be highlighted more prominently. (Line 1-14) If possible, include specific quantitative results (e.g., percentage inhibition of fungal growth) to give a clearer picture of the study's outcomes. This adds weight to the findings and helps readers understand the scale of the effect. The conclusion section of the abstract could briefly mention the potential practical applications of this research in sustainable agriculture, such as the use of macro-algae as a natural alternative to chemical fungicides.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>The manuscript's structure is appropriate for a scientific article, but with some adjustments, it could be more effective in communicating the research findings and their significance.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Subsection Clarity:</b> While the manuscript is well-structured, the subsection titles could be slightly more descriptive. For example, instead of "Molecular Characterization," a title like "Molecular Characterization of <i>Alternaria solani</i>" would be more informative.</li> <li><b>Results and Discussion Integration:</b> The Results and Discussion sections are combined, which is common, but the manuscript might benefit from clearly separating the two. This would allow for a more in-depth analysis of the data in the Discussion section, emphasizing the implications and significance of the findings.</li> <li><b>Conclusions:</b> The manuscript would benefit from a distinct "Conclusions" section that succinctly summarizes the key findings, their implications, and potential future directions. The conclusions are somewhat embedded within the discussion, which might dilute their impact.</li> </ol>	
<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>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, as it follows a well-established methodology for assessing the antifungal potential of macro-algae against <i>Alternaria solani</i>. Using molecular characterization techniques such as PCR and sequencing to confirm the identity of the fungal pathogen adds credibility to the study's findings. Additionally, the inclusion of appropriate controls and the application of statistical analysis (ANOVA) to evaluate the results' significance further support the data's reliability. The systematic approach to screening various macro-</p>	

**Review Form 3**

	algae and the clear documentation of experimental procedures suggest that the study was conducted with scientific rigor, making the findings trustworthy and valuable to the field.	
<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>=</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally relevant and provide a good foundation for the study. However, the following observations and suggestions can help improve the reference list:</p> <p><b>Suggestions for Additional References:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Recent Reviews on Natural Antifungal Agents:</b> Consider adding recent review articles that discuss the broader context of using natural products, including macro-algae, as antifungal agents in agriculture. These could provide a more comprehensive background and justify the study's relevance in current research.</li> <li><b>2. Studies on Kappaphycus alvarezii and Other Seaweeds:</b> If there are recent studies specifically focusing on Kappaphycus alvarezii or other seaweeds with antifungal properties, including these would strengthen the rationale for selecting these organisms in your research.</li> <li><b>3. Advancements in Molecular Characterization Techniques:</b> Including recent advancements or reviews on molecular techniques used in plant pathology could add depth to the methods section, highlighting the reliability and modernity of the techniques used.</li> </ol>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas that require improvement to enhance clarity, readability, and professionalism. There are several grammatical errors, particularly related to verb tense consistency, article usage, and sentence structure. For example, some sentences are written in the future tense when they should be in the past tense, given that the study has already been conducted. Ensuring consistency in verb tense is crucial for scholarly writing.</p> <p>A few instances of awkward phrasing or word choice can be refined. For instance, "The vegetable has been consumed the second most after potatoes" could be rephrased to "Tomato is the second most consumed vegetable after potatoes."</p> <p>While the manuscript is understandable, it would benefit from a thorough proofreading and editing to address grammatical errors, improve sentence structure, and enhance overall clarity. Ensuring high-quality language will significantly improve the manuscript's impact and readability in scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>In conclusion, this manuscript presents valuable research on the antifungal potential of macro-algae against Alternaria solani, offering promising insights for sustainable agriculture. While the study is scientifically sound and contributes meaningfully to the field, minor revisions in language, clarity, and the inclusion of recent references will further enhance its quality and impact.</p>	

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

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Omkar S Kamble</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>