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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:

**Compulsory REVISION comments**

The manuscript contains some interesting data, and it would become acceptable for publication. However, the current presentation is quite disordered and confused, and the authors should try to put a number of points in order before publication.

The following points should be addressed to improve the quality and the clarity of the results herein presented.

- **English should be edited.** There are abundant mistakes throughout the manuscript. Replace rate by ratio. Use g for grams always.

- **Abstract** (in relation with the entire manuscript):
  
  Lines 8-9: “*vitro* and *in vivo* conditions to observe the effect of one bioagent three plant extracts and one fungicide against *Alternaria brassicae*”.
  
  It seems that these are 5 different treatments. However, at 150-152, there are 6. Modify the abstract according to the manuscript. It is obvious that the abstract should a resume of the manuscript. This is trivial, please, do not waste your time and do not waste the time of others. Try to be uniform in the description of treatments. For instance, at heading of Table 1, there is again 5 treatments (*Effect of phyto-extract, biological agent and chemicals on the development of Alternaria leaf blight of mustard in field*). According that heading, it seems that the fungicide is considered a chemical. Well, this might be correct, but the consideration should be the same in the entire manuscript, otherwise the readers get confuse. Authors should avoid that.

  - **Line 13:** effective in reducing disease severity (81.23%) and infection rate which increased the yield
    
    a) Yield of what?. At lines 158, 160, 161, 163, and in Figure 2, the yield seems to be Kg/ha, but how those yields are calculated? This is not a laboratory experiment…..

    b) This should be an extrapolation, but there is any explanation in the method section.

    c) Replace 81.23 by 81.23%. The decimal figures without any statistics and standard deviation are meaningless. Same for other values in abstract.

  - **Line 16:** “disease severity and 68.18% increase in yield in comparison to SAR compound”. What is SAR?. Please define.

  - **Line 17:** fungal antagonist i.e. *Trichoderma viride* (48.33% and 36.27%) reduction

  *Trichoderma viride* is a fungus, it is not a fungal antagonist. This sentence needs to be re-written. Authors should be precise in order to get manuscript acceptance.

- **Introduction** about the economic importance of rapeseed and mustard in India and West Bengal is OK. The importance of controlling fungal infections is out of doubt.

- **Lines 51.53,** at the end of the introduction. However, the meaning of the last sentence is not clear.…”Salicylic acid, Chitosan, etc. one of the important aspect of induced resistance is that it is not underlined by genome alterations (mutations, integration of foreign genetic material), which enhances its biological safety (Edreva, 2004)”

- **Lines 77-78:** salicylic acid @ 2 ppm were sprayed before appearance of the disease. While, 78 phyto-extracts and Dithane M-45 @ 0.2 % 2 ppm is a very low concentration. Please, supply reference for that.

  What is the meaning of using the sign @? From time to time?

  What is Dithane M-45? At line 115: Mancozeb (Dithane M-45) @ 0.02 %, but the same term should be used and stated from the beginning. On the other hand, commercial registered names should be avoided.

- **Line 86:** The formula is trivial and unnecessary in a scientific paper.

- **Line 93:** Specify the meaning of PDI. Is PDI the percentage disease index?. If so, specify.

- **Formula** at lines 93 and 128 are very similar. Only one time is enough.

- **Line 144:** that formula is difficult to understand, and the reference anonymous is difficult to find for future readers. Can the authors improve the meaning of this part.

- **Lines 150-152:** Phyto-extracts (*Lantana camera, Allium sativum* and *Zingiber officinale*), biological agent (*Trichoderma viride*), fungicide (Mancozeb 75% WP) and SAR compound (Salicylic acid).
It is clear the use of 6 different treatments, 3 phytoextracts, 1 biological agent, 1 fungicide and 1 chemical. Modify the abstract according to that.

Table 1: last row: \( SE(\text{treatment mean})=\text{CD at (5%)} = \)

What is the meaning of that row? (same at Table 2)

The apparent infection rate is plotted at Figure 1, but this parameter is not defined at methods.

Line 190: *Lantana camera* was the most effective extract....

Replace extract by phyto-extract

Line 200: “the accumulation of PR protein”.

What is PR protein? Authors should try to avoid the appearance of new components without any previous explanation at the introduction.

Line 201: Similar findings with salicylic acid @ g/ml.

What concentration?. Please, consider lines 77-78, and the justification of the 2 ppm concentration used in this study.

Why *Tricoderma viride* is used 2% at Table 1 and 4% at Table 2?. Can the authors justify the criteria for the concentrations used in this work?

Lines 230-233: “Presence of excessive sugar content in PDA was probably determined the effect of salicylic acid against the growth of *Alternaria brassicae* as it decrease the starch content in host. The results of bio agent further confirm the findings of Meena et al, 2003 and Atwal et. al., 2004”.

This is very confuse. What the authors mean with the expression “excessive sugar content”. What “bio agent” means? Does it refer to *Tricoderma*?

Why *Zingiber officinale* is missing at plates 1 and 2. Why the name of this phytoextract is *zing zingevirae* at Figure 3?. Please, try to be uniform. It is difficult to be so disordered.... The labels and headings of the figures and plates should also be homogeneous.

**Minor REVISION comments**

**Optional/General comments**

The manuscript contains some interesting data, and it would become acceptable for publication. However, the current presentation is quite disordered and confused, and the authors should try to put a number of points in order before publication. My advice is that the manuscripts should be carefully checked by the authors before submission.
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