



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_28893
Title of the Manuscript:	A combination fungicide for the management of blast and sheath blight disease of paddy
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:

(<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	• Grammatical mistakes should be revised. • The Graphical representation should be in the manuscript. • Revised for statistical tools I read this article thoroughly and found that this article could be a good research article if the authors designed the study in proper manner and wrote it in a nice scientific way. The communication skills are very poor as they made many mistakes in sentence structure. The authors made lots of silly mistakes in the manuscript. There are few comments in this manuscript headingwise- 1. Introduction- ○ Language is very poor, the sentences are not well written and made lots of grammatical mistakes that could be very hard to understand. ○ The citing way of references (Format of journal) in introduction text is not in an order so there are lots of references which are missing in the text such 1 & 8 and 2, 3,4 are not found in order and they are somewhere in the middle of the text. ○ The authors only mentioned very few statistics even though there are tons of studies have already done on blast and sheath blight	We have revised our MS as per the suggestions MS has been revised for grammatical mistakes We have corrected the format as per the journal standards



SDI Review Form 1.6

	fungicides combinations worldwide. ○ The authors did not go through much in literature and review articles. 2. Materials & methods- ○ Language is poor, the sentences are not well written and made lots of grammatical mistakes that could be very difficult to understand. ○ I was not able to understand why the authors used only one popular susceptible variety BPT5024 and how they know this variety is susceptible as they did not quote any reference on this variety. ○ This study could be a good research if the authors would have chosen many varieties including some resistant ones too or might be some other genotypes just for the screening along with this popular variety. ○ In the field plots, the authors did not use any border line for spreading the diseases. ○ I did not get any information about the fungus strains of blast and sheath blight such as this fungicide combination is used for what strains of blast and sheath blight pathogens. ○ I was unable to understand what based of the authors made new combinations of formulation viz., Trifloxystrobin 25% + Tebuconazole 50% (Nativo 75 WG), Kresoximethyl (Ergon 44.3	We have included only recent and relevant reviews to avoid bulkiness We have included only recent and relevant reviews to avoid bulkiness MS has been revised for grammatical mistakes and other technical corrections We are using BPT-5204 regularly as a susceptible check for blast and sheath blight evaluation (for host plant resistance as well as for management trials). As per our own experience, BPT-5204 is highly susceptible to blast and sheath blight diseases. Moreover, there were no references or claims that BPT-5204 is a resistant to above diseases. Border lines are not essential as the Experimental field was surrounded by continuous stretches of BPT-5204. About 300 ac of BPT-5204 was planted and our experiment was laid out in that field only.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	SC), Thifluzmide 24 SC (Spencer), Avatar (Hexaconazole 4% + Zineb 68%), SAAF 75 WP (Carbendazim 12% + Mancozeb 63% WP) and Merger (Tricyclazole 18% + Mancozeb 62 % WP). ○ That means they have already tested other combinations such as Trifloxystrobin 10% + Tebuconazole 20% (Nativo 75 WG), Kresoximethyl (Ergon 44.3 SC), Thifluzmide 24 SC (Spencer), Avatar (Hexaconazole 50% + Zineb 25%) etc. ○ The authors did not mention how they developed inoculum of pathogens for artificial pathogens inoculation and there is no pictures mentioned for pathogens in the manuscript. ○ What statistical tools were used in this study for data analysis? ○ The authors used PDI why? Why they not used the area under the disease progress curve (AUDPC) for diareases severity? 3. Results & discussion- ○ The results and discussion are written very vague. ○ The authors only mentioned the tables but they did not use any graphical representation that is very effective to understand the findings comparatively. ○ Sometimes the readers use the graphs to	I don't think this information is relevant here. As there were no reports of strain specific fungicides especially in blast and sheath blight diseases of paddy. All these fungicidal combinations included the mixture of two different groups of fungicides having different mode of action against fungal physiology. Such products are popular due to increased efficacy and lower risk of development of fungicide resistance (fungi has to undergo many mutations in its physiology to develop resistance against two differently acting poisonous molecules). Theses combinations are available in the market and we just made a scientific investigation to check their efficacy against multiple disease of paddy. - Proper reference has been cited for artificial inoculation (Bhaktavastalam et al., 1978) Data were analysed using Micro Soft Excel (version 2007). As per our knowledge, for fungicidal bio-
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	understand what the authors studied in the research but there is no any graph. ○ The authors mentioned all the results in numbers in the form of tables that is good but not always good. ○ In the end of results & discussion, the authors wrote one sentence "For sheath blight, though cultivation of resistant variety is the best option but till date no such variety is available to the farmers" how they know about all the rice varieties even though they did not quote any reference. Even though, there are many breeders at Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi have already developed many sheath blight resistant varieties for northern and southern parts of India.	efficacy studies, PDI is sufficient. Now this part has been revised for more clarity. Graphical representation has been included in the revised MS Graphical representation has been included in the revised MS We accept that breeders have developed many varieties resistant to sheath blight but, adoption of such varieties under farmer filed is still at infantry stage. We have modify the sentence accordingly
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Make sure about reference order in the text.	This issue has been addressed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Results and discussion should be separated.	As per the journal standards, we have a liberty of combining the result and discussion chapters together.