

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ ARRB_123260</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Trichoderma harzianum and selected botanicals on brown leaf spot of Paddy (Oryza sativa L.) caused by Helminthosporium oryzae (Breda de Haan)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</b>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>Because of the harmful effects of agrochemicals that have already harmed our ecosystem, researchers are more concerned about implementation of organic and biological management of plant diseases, as they are eco-friendly. The present study is attributed to the biological control of plant diseases that can be useful for prospects.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the paper is ordinary and common. It should be changed.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the manuscript is not comprehensive. Abstract is the key section of the manuscript, it displays the entire research with inputs and outputs and contain logical, reasonable, discriminative studies.</p> <p>So here in the abstract, only results of the papers have been shown. The main theme and concept of the paper and conclusion are missing.</p> <p>The manuscript (Ms_JABB_123260) entitled "Effect of <i>Trichoderma harzianum</i> and selected botanicals on brown leaf spot of Paddy (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) caused by <i>Helminthosporium oryzae</i> (Breda de Haan)" contained the following errors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Abstract:</b> The abstract is the key section of the manuscript, it displays the entire research with inputs and outputs and contains logical, reasonable, discriminative studies. So here in the abstract, only the results of the papers have been shown. The main theme and concept of the paper and conclusion are missing.</li> <li><b>Introduction:</b> The manuscript should follow the journal rules for writing references in the paper. The manuscript contains some scientific naming errors, e.g. Species name must be written with genus initials after the first writing of the name, it must be italic etc.</li> </ol>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p><b>Materials and methods:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ The section of materials and methods doesn't contain the procedure that shows the infestation method of pathogens. How did you apply pathogens? Through which medium? What was the ratio and concentration of pathogens? What was the time of infesting the pathogens, before or after seed sowing, if after, then at what stage of plant growth?</li> <li>□ The section of materials and methods is not well written. It doesn't comprise the procedure of antagonistic fungi application (<i>Trichoderma harzianum</i>) as it is written in the title and abstract of the manuscript. The antagonist preparation and application are missing in the whole section of materials and methods.</li> <li>□ Some sentences are very long, and contain the combination of several sentences. This kind of sentence should be splitted and write separately. In this way, it can be easy to understand.</li> <li>□ The references of the followed-methods, scale and formula are missing?</li> </ul>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Biological control for inhibiting pathogens is gaining more importance rather than the use of agrochemicals that threaten our ecosystem. The present study is based on biological control of plant diseases that can be useful for the future. However, it contains several missing contents in the manuscript that should be fixed.</p>	

### Review Form 3

<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 manuscript comprised few references. The whole section of materials and method is lack of references, as references of methods, scales and formula should be mentioned. Discussion section is poor without references.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript have grammatical mistakes, large sentences that are difficult to understand etc.</p> <p>The graph should be made properly, here an extra place (Treatments) have also been included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Moreover, be careful in writing the scientific name in graph either, they should be according to the rules.</li> <li>☐ Table title is always written on the upper side of the table. However, written-title of the table is not proper.</li> </ul>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p><b>. Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ The discussion section is very poorly written. It is very short, lack of references, lack of logic, is based on assumptions, is non-rational, etc.</li> <li>☐ The study should not be based on assumptions, there must be a proof.</li> <li>☐ There is a lack of reference or proof of having phytochemicals in the materials, must write in the discussion.</li> <li>☐ Re-write the discussion.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, scientific names are not according to the scientific rules throughout the paper and the manuscript contains grammar mistakes.</p> <p>The disease causing pathogen used for this studies, have to be molecularly identified for the publication in this well-reputed journal.</p>	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Paras Shah</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Hainan University, China</b></p>