

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_121889</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“Efficacy of Trichoderma viride and leaf extracts against southern corn leaf blight ( Bipolaris maydis) of maize (Zea mays L.)”</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### 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>
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 article is important because non-toxic alternatives to food are required. This article is important because non-toxic alternatives to food are required. Sustainable crop management is required and the use of Trichoderma can be good.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggest: Efficacy of <i>Trichoderma viride</i> and leaf extracts against <i>Bipolaris maydis</i> of <i>Zea mays</i> L	
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.	It is necessary to summarize more the mythology part and increase the results part.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	It is solid and has a scientific part. However, the tables need to be improved. In addition, correct spelling.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It is necessary to put more current quotes, since it has very old quotes. It is suggested to renew and add more appointments.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	He suggests that the article be reviewed by an English language expert.	
Optional/General comments		

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduardo Osorio Hernandez
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autonoma de Tamaulipas, México