

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121626
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of sesamum genotypes against powdery mildew disease
Type of the 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The information in the article is indeed valuable; however, there seems to be a confusion regarding the objectives in the methodology section. Clarifying these points would enhance the overall clarity and impact of the research.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article suitable</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article comprehensive</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections and structure must improve.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript in question can add more sufficient scientific rigor and technical validation, Further improvements and thorough revisions are essential to enhance its robustness. It is crucial to include information on local ambient conditions and pathogen identification in your analysis, as this data is vital for understanding genotype resistance to specific species. Integrating these factors will enhance the robustness of your findings</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>References can be expanded</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality must improve.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript aims to conduct a screening of varieties; however, the Methods and Materials section lacks clarity. Additionally, there are no details provided on how the presence of the pathogen was confirmed, which would strengthen the study's rigor. Discussion section can be expanded.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arnaldo Esquivel-Fariña
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional de Asunción, Paraguay