



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_22742
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Biological Control Antagonists Adsorbed on Chitosan Immobilised Silica Nanocomposite on Ralstonia solanacearum and Growth of Tomato Seedlings
Type of the Article	Original research Articles

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The paper on “Effect of Biological Control Antagonists Adsorbed on Chitosan Immobilised Silica Nanocomposite on Ralstonia solanacearum and Growth of Tomato Seedlings” was prepared very well in an understandable manner. The English language used is standard. The conclusions were well justified and based on the research results presented in the paper. Thus, I have just a few minor comments on this paper to the authors for the purpose of improving the paper readability. Some sentences are too long making some parts incomprehensible.</p> <p>Methodology: The sentences are too long. Lines 130-131: Bring back the other member of the equality on the same line. Line 155: sterilised or sterilised ?</p>	<p>Addressed in the whole paper where appropriate.</p> <p>Attempted to shorten the sentences.</p> <p>sterilized</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		