



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_47775
Title of the Manuscript:	Anatomy and Biochemical study of Collar Rot Resistance in Eggplant
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Abstract: recast line 5-6 Introduction: Line 7-8 recast for better understanding: So there is a need of its enough and better cultivation. Line 13: damp what? Not clear Line 17: It likes soft tissues not well structured Line 20: and/or not and or, matured not mature Line 31: respect to disease not respect of disease Line 34: replace IPM Lab accession no. IPM Lab-09 with IPM Lab with accession number IPM Lab-09</p> <p>Materials and methods Line 47 and 48: Laboratory not laboratory Line 55: ml/cft is not the correct unit but ml/cf Line 63 and 64: recast Line 66: full meaning of APDA before abbreviation Line 68: full meaning of PDA before abbreviation Line 72: is there any reason for Inoculating in the afternoon? Give reason or reference Recast line 95 and 96 Recast line 100 -102. . is this (Version 1998) correct? Full meaning of DMRT Line 131: uninoculated control varieties is better Line 32: give the percentage for the highest Line 134-5: used another word for killed or rephrase the sentence Recast line 144-147 for better understanding Line 157: is not comprehensible Line 172: got infected and not got infection</p> <p>What I saw is result and can hardly depict where the discussion started. Differentiate between result and discussion or state clearly if both result and discussion are merged Line 198-199: rephrase Line 190: there should be comma after Dohazari G Line 214 effect serious in disruption No reference(s) seen in the presumed discussion for 3.4 Biochemical study Reconstruct line 248-249</p> <p>Line 256-258: is not well written, recast Line 282; Schaaf [34] revealed THAT ascorbic..... Line 291: this statement Kumar <i>et al.</i> [29], who showed <i>Albugo candida</i> is not well constructed Check through; is it mung bean or mungbean? Be consistent.</p> <p>Conclusion is not well written comprehensively and need to be address. Most of the references are not well cited, check and effect correction</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Introduction: sentences from line 1-2 are not well constructed Line 3: calorific values not value</p> <p>What the rational between the spacing?</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Well written but there is need for critical check ups for major corrections as indicated above.	

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Eremwanarue, Aibuedefe Osagie</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Benin, Nigeria</i>