

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_81957
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Pseudomonas fluorescens and botanicals against tikka leaf spot disease (Cercospora arachidicola, Cercospora personatum) of groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.)
Type of the 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>There are two figures on page 3 of the sending file that do not have a caption. It is then suggested that legends be placed on these figures and with that all the numbers of the other figures after these are changed in the text.</p> <p>In the excerpt from the topic 'Post-Shoot height, fresh weight and dry weight influenced by different treatments' below "Maximum plant height was recorded in T3 – Seed treated with <i>P. fluorescens</i> @5gm/kg seed + Neem oil spray @1% (42.76).” does not reflect the value found in Table 2, which is 12.76. Please correct the table for the value described in the text.</p> <p>In the eight paragraphs that describe the results presented in Table 2, going from the plant height (cm) to the maximum dry weight, it is recommended to mention throughout the texts of these paragraphs that the values and results are present in Table 2. Looking at the details in each of these paragraphs, readers can immediately refer to the above-mentioned Table and are thus not lost in the text, which, in particular, is how this reviewer felt when reading.</p> <p>Here, the same previous observation is made, throughout the text, mentioning that the results described are present in Table 3. In addition, correlating the results obtained in a longer way during the writing of the topic 'Discussion'</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In addition, although there is in the topic 'discussion' some results from the literature that are in line with those observed in the present study, it is suggested that more relationships be made between the results of Table 2. Note that this contains several relevant information for the study and that can be further explored through the correlation of the results obtained and increasing knowledge about the conclusions of this study. This greater discussion of results can be added to the topic with the same name, enhancing even more knowledge about the topic.</p> <p>To reporting here, some results of the study by Hasan (2014) and Ganeshan (2015) which, as observed by this reviewer, evaluates the biological control of the same type of disease and cultivar as in the present study, in addition to studying the same microorganism explored here. The referential support of a similar study, with the comparison of more current results, reflects agreement or not with the proposed method to reduce the research problem evaluated in the manuscript.</p> <p>In this topic 'discussão', there was a lack of bibliographic reference that compares the results of this manuscript with other studies. As previously suggested, correlating the results achieved and which are in tables 2 and 3 can be an alternative. This topic can be made more robust and complement the readers' knowledge about the proposed topic and evaluated through an application of a very rigorous methodological study.</p> <p>It is also suggested that Figure 1, which should change its number due to the two initial Figures still present in the topic 'materials and methods', be placed before or after Table 3 and before the topic 'discussion' since it is about results described there. As it is, at the end of the text, it gets very lost in the manuscript and can be confusing.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Both the topic 'introduction' and the topic 'materials and methods' are well written by the authors and well detailed, thus facilitating the readers' understanding of the main subject to be addressed in the manuscript. The richness of the details gives the importance of the theme chosen to be approached, as well as the methodological contribution of the research and it is still a study of added value to the location where the research was carried out, thus allowing the results to be disseminated in that place after scientific publication.	
----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

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:	Alan Kelbis Oliveira Lima
Department, University & Country	University of Brasília, Brazil