

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Pathogen Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_78888
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro Effect of Alum on Microbes Associated with Foliar Phytoplasma Disease of Noni
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>My Overall Evaluation</b></p> <p>The theme <i>In vitro</i> Effect of Alum on Microbes Associated with Foliar Phytoplasma Disease of Noni is indeed important and especially for contexts in the Agricultural and medical field, this theme should indeed receive greater attention and to that end I would like to thank you for bringing together this writeup on this issue. However, the paper is challenged on many fronts with regard to the implementation of this larger objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The article title is appropriate.</li> <li>• Abstract is appropriate.</li> <li>• Keywords is ok.</li> <li>• Introduction is appropriate.</li> <li>• Novelty of the work be established.</li> <li>• There are few grammatical and spelling mistakes. Please double check you text and correct them all.</li> <li>• The tables and figures in the text substantiate your claim.</li> <li>• The purpose or purported significance of the article is explicitly stated.</li> <li>• The research study methods are explained clearly.</li> <li>• Results and Discussion is appropriate</li> <li>• The conclusions is appropriate.</li> <li>• The references are comprehensive.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<b>Accepted</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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)
<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>Raimi Morufu Olalekan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Niger Delta University, Nigeria</b>