

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_130969
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on the compatibility of Trichoderma asperellum (Tr-9) with nematicide Carbofuran and Cassava based biopesticide, Nanma under in-vitro conditions
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript presents valuable insights into the compatibility of Trichoderma asperellum (Tr-9) with Carbofuran and the cassava-based biopesticide, Nanma. Given the increasing need for sustainable nematode management strategies, the study contributes significantly to integrated pest management (IPM) approaches. The findings are particularly relevant for researchers and practitioners involved in biocontrol methods for root-knot nematodes, aiding in optimizing nematicide use without compromising beneficial fungal agents.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate and accurately reflects the study’s focus. However, for clarity, consider revising it to: “Compatibility of Trichoderma asperellum (Tr-9) with Carbofuran and Cassava-based Biopesticide Nanma under In-vitro Conditions” to enhance readability.	
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.	The abstract effectively summarizes the study, but it could be improved by explicitly stating the methodology (e.g., poisoned food technique), including the exact statistical methods used, and highlighting key implications for integrated nematode management. Also, consider a brief mention of future research directions.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The study is methodologically sound, and the experimental design is appropriate for evaluating compatibility. However, additional statistical clarifications on the significance of differences between treatments would improve robustness. Providing confidence intervals or error bars in figures would enhance data interpretation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and up-to-date, covering key literature in the field. However, adding a few recent studies (post-2022) on Trichoderma compatibility with nematicides/biopesticides would further strengthen the discussion section.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is well-written but has minor grammatical inconsistencies. A thorough proofreading for sentence structure and coherence is recommended. For example, the phrase “Instead of relying solely on a biopesticide-based strategy, incorporating chemical methods along with biological approaches is more effective for managing nematodes” could be restructured for clarity.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Consider including a flowchart or diagram summarizing the experimental workflow for better comprehension.</p> <p>Ensure all figures and tables are of high resolution and properly formatted for publication.</p> <p>The discussion could be expanded to compare findings with broader literature on biopesticide interactions with beneficial fungi.</p> <p>No ethical concerns were identified. No competing interests were declared. No evidence of plagiarism was detected. The manuscript appears original and well-referenced.</p> <p>The manuscript is well-structured and presents important findings for sustainable pest management. Minor revisions in language clarity, statistical representation, and additional contextual discussions would further improve its quality. The authors are encouraged to address these points for enhanced readability and impact.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luiz Antonio Soares Cardoso
Department, University & Country	Instituto Federal de Educacao, Brazil