

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_114212
Title of the Manuscript:	Integrated effect of Pseudomonas sp. and bioresources against Alternaria leaf spot disease of brinjal (Solanum melongena L.)
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, but the manuscript looks like the work of a very young scientist. This is welcome in scientific community, and is encouraged to start growing with his/her paper (manuscript).</p> <p>It is suitable from the tone of the author(s), but I suggest she/he/they look at this: Application of Pseudomonas "sp." and bio-resources in controlling Alternaria leaf spot disease of Brinjal (Solanum melongena .L.)</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. I strongly suggest that all the sub-sections are joined and their spaces closed to have block scientific report.</p> <p>It is not correct as it is, but if the reviewer's comments 1 through 5 are effected, it will become better.</p> <p>The references are not bad for the volume of work done, but one reference; Horticulture Statistics Division,2018 appeared in manuscript but not in references. Also, Wheeler, B C J, (1969) could not be seen in the manuscript, but appeared in the references. Let every references that are in the manuscript, also show in the reference section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is manageably okay, but as I cited in (1) that the contents looked that of young researcher(s), the article should be accepted and the author(s) subjected to scientific writing mentoring.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author(s) should be welcomed with open arms and put mentorship with the supervision of a generous older scientist(s).</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>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:	Michael Olisa Nwankwo
Department, University & Country	Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Nigeria