

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_130341
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of talc formulation (TNAUPc001) of egg parasitic fungus, <i>Pochonia chlamydosporia</i> on the management of root-knot nematode, <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> in brinjal, ( <i>Solanum melongena</i> ).
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	his manuscript contributes significantly to the scientific community by presenting an innovative and sustainable strategy for managing root-knot nematodes, a persistent pest affecting brinjal crops. By evaluating the effectiveness of a talc-based formulation of <i>Pochonia chlamydosporia</i> (TNAU Pc001) across various application methods, it highlights the potential of biological control in reducing nematode populations while enhancing crop yield. The findings underscore the importance of integrated pest management approaches that minimize chemical usage and environmental impact.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title of the manuscript, " <b>Effectiveness of talc formulation (TNAUPc001) of egg parasitic fungus, <i>Pochonia chlamydosporia</i> on the management of root-knot nematode, <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> in brinjal (<i>Solanum melongena</i>)</b> ", is informative	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract provides a good summary of the study, including its objectives, methodology, key results, and conclusion.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears scientifically sound based on the information provided. It follows an appropriate experimental design, employs standard techniques, and presents results backed by statistical analysis.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The manuscript cites a variety of references, including foundational texts, such as Agrios (2005) and Cobb (1918), and recent studies, such as Ghahremani et al. (2019) and Pravez et al. (2024). While the references are relevant, there are areas where additional or updated citations could strengthen the manuscript.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language of the manuscript is mostly clear and suitable for scholarly communication	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Based on the information provided in the manuscript, there are no obvious ethical concerns. Based on the manuscript, no explicit competing interest issues are disclosed	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zaheen Hasan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>M.L.K.(P.G.) College, India</b>