

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_102039</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effects of introduced tomato varieties and chemical fungicides on the incidence and severity of Late blight, caused by Phytophthora infestans (Mont. de Bary) in the Western region in Cameroon</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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:

<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, it is important as it provides the solution to an agricultural problem using the scientific method.</p> <p>2. The title has too many words, an alternative title is suggested in the review file.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes, they are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the article is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, they are sufficient and recent; however, there are citations in the text that are not included in the references.</p> <p>Try to include the observations, among which the following stand out: very long paragraphs; in the results section, do not describe completely what is in the tables, but rather the most important findings; include the main conclusion indicated in the review file.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Oscar Arath Grageda Cabrera</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales, México</b>