

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_123487</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bioefficacy of different fungal bio-agents on juvenile mortality of root knot nematode, <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> infecting tomato under laboratory conditions</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	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>Keeping in view the negative impacts of chemical nematicides on the environment, bioagents have come up as an ecofriendly and sustainable method of controlling nematodes in important crops like tomato. This research work has focused on the bioefficacy of different bioagents to manage <i>M. incognita</i>, a critical root knot nematode that affects tomato crop.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes, the title is complete in itself and suitable.</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>Yes, the abstract is concise and comprehensive, however, it needs some minor corrections as have been mentioned in the correction copy.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections have been written well, but lack structural integrity. The introduction part needs a major change. The authors can describe a bit more about biopesticides/bioagents and any data related to their use and efficacy. The materials and methods have been written briefly, yet provide all the information. The results and discussions are well-supported by research studies, tables and graph. However, there is NO conclusion part. The authors are requested to kindly conclude their findings in a paragraph of about 150-200 words.</p>	
<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>The manuscript is scientifically robust due to the fact that it discusses about an important problem of root knot nematode infestation on economic crops like tomato, and provides a sustainable and chemical-free solution that is backed up by a good research study. All the parts of the manuscript adhere to the mentioned title, and the results look very promising as well.</p>	
<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>The references are sufficient, but most of them are not recent. The authors are hereby requested to kindly add references from 2015-2024, as the work is new and in its early stages.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>It is good, but grammatically poor. The authors are advised to look into this matter.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>None.</p>	

### 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>Swagat Ranjan Behera</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, India</b>