

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_127139
Title of the Manuscript:	Pathogenicity test of Rhizoctonia solani isolates collected from naturally infected soybean plants in different geographical locations of Chhattisgarh
Type of the Article	Paper

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The fungus <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> is considered one of the important soil fungi that is of great importance due to the losses it causes in crops, which calls for conducting many research and experiments to control the severity of the disease	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	suitable	
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.	delete line No 17	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate with some clarifications in the material	
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 needs revision in order to clarify the importance of the disease on soybeans, because this fungus <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> is an important fungus in soil borne that causes a severe infection of seeds and seedlings, but leaf blight is a secondary infection as a result of the disease being transmitted to the rest of the seedlings and their death.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review References There is a reference missing from the discussion (Rahayu (2014)). - Review writing of this reference: Guney (2018) 	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	appropriate	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These symptoms come: Leaf infection or leaf blight is a secondary result after root infection and rot. - <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> soybean caused by Seedling Blight not aerial blight - Detached leaf method: where is method - Is JS 97-52 soybean variety sensitive? - What is the method of estimating the disease on the leaf tissue? And where reference ? - Review References There is a reference missing from the discussion (Rahayu (2014)). - Review writing of this reference: Guney (2018) 	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hend Talat Eid Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Plant Pathology Institute, Egypt