



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_26120
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicity of fungicides inhibitors to Phytophthora megakarya in cacao
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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract. A conclusion should be added. Keywords: remove Fungicide, toxicity, Phytophthora megakarya and place keywords that complement the title. Introduction: Please include references about cuprous oxide, Copper hydroxide and Copper hydroxide + metalaxyl use and evidences of effective, environment-friendly and lower mammalian toxicity. Materials and methods: Please added statistical analysis Results and discussions: with respect to result "The highest antifungal of 85.25% mycelial inhibition of P. megakarya was also recorded at 2.5mg/ml of copper hydroxide + metalaxyl and EC50 value of this active ingredient was estimated as 0.18mg/ml. is an important results however is necessary include a discussion for explain this result. a photograph can be included as inhibitory fungal growth evidence.	All corrections effected. Probit is a sufficient and established statistical analysis, no other statistical analysis is required for this particular study. Studies carried out on use of copper-based fungicides have NOT include toxicity estimation of the active ingredient but only on efficacy of the a.i.. Thus there are scarce information to discuss the result of this study. The discussion provided is sufficient for the record of toxicity of these active ingredients. No photograph in the study.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		