

Review Form 3

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

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.	Given the importance of maize in the world production of food grains, it is important to find solutions to attacks by enemies of its crop. Hence the importance of this study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is good an scientific	
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. But It does not present the context, the problem and the objective of the work	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is not correct. The editorial line of the newspaper was not respected. The font and size of the writing are not respected. Specify the software used for statistical analysis. Separate the results from the discussion.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically acceptable because the methodology is correct. The isolation and purification of the pathogen are correct as well as the various treatments carried out. However, the results have not been sufficiently discussed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	References are sufficient but are not recent. According to the editorial line of the newspaper, references in the text are designated by numbers in order of appearance in the text. In the Bibliographic References paragraph, the authors are written under this model: 1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes, the linguistic quality is acceptable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	N'goran Ahou Regine Epouse Bla
Department, University & Country	Universite Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo, Cote d'Ivoire