

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_110881
Title of the Manuscript:	IN VITRO ANTIFUNGAL ACTIVITY OF CASSIA FISTULA L. EXTRACTS AGAINST MACROPHOMINA PHASEOLINA (TASSI.) GOID.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript under review addresses a pertinent issue in the scientific community, contributing valuable insights to the existing body of knowledge. The research findings are likely to have a meaningful impact on the field, making the manuscript important for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title of the article effectively encapsulates the essence of the research, providing readers with a clear understanding of the study's focus. However, please look at my suggestion in the edited manuscript. It would be better if the name changed into <i>IN VITRO ANTIFUNGAL PROPERTY OF CASSIA FISTULA L. EXTRACTS AGAINST THE FUNGAL PATHOGEN MACROPHOMINA PHASEOLINA (TASSI.) GOID.</i></p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is well-crafted and comprehensive. It succinctly summarizes the research objectives, methods, key findings, and implications, offering a solid overview for potential readers.</p> <p>4. The manuscript's subsections and overall structure are appropriately organized, facilitating a logical flow of information. Each section contributes to the overall coherence of the document, enhancing its readability.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, with well-supported arguments, robust methodologies, and clear data presentation. However, a more detailed analysis may be necessary to confirm the accuracy of specific claims and interpretations.</p> <p>6. The references provided are relevant and sufficiently recent, demonstrating a thorough review of the existing literature. However, to enhance the manuscript's scholarly foundation, it is recommended to consider including [specific types of references or additional recent publications] to strengthen the supporting evidence and contextual relevance.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are a few instances where minor grammatical issues were observed. It is recommended that the author carefully proofread the manuscript to address these concerns and ensure a polished and precise presentation for scholarly readership.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	NIL	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pavitra Paramalingam
Department, University & Country	Malaysia