

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_121564</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ADVANCES IN SUNFLOWER POWDERY MILDEW AND Alternariaster LEAF SPOT MANAGEMENT: EXPLORING THE POTENTIAL OF COMBINED NEW FUNGICIDE MOLECULES</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
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.	Sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annuus</i> L.) is a significant oilseed crop cultivated worldwide for its versatile uses in the food, industrial, and pharmaceutical sectors. It is renowned for its high oil content, nutritional value, adaptability to various climates, and environmental benefits. However there is an enormous potential for expansion of sunflower if is planted as second summer crop in succession to Soybean. This paper aims to minimize the loss incurred by these two economically important disease of Sunflower by means of chemical management along with standard integrated disease management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of the article should be simple one. Advised to Modify and Recast the title of the paper in simple form and write the Causal organism of both the diseases.	
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.	Abstract of the article found satisfactory. Authors may advised to mention the control treatment of the experiment in the abstract so that the comparative statement with the experimental treatment should be clearly understood.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes subsection and structure of the manuscript is found to be satisfactory. Only in table 3 and 4 control treatment should be described elaborately for understanding. Advised to add the reference of the scale of disease severity . Graphical representation may be incorporated for easy understanding of the disease severity of all the treatments.	
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.	The manuscript is overall satisfactory as the chemical Fluxapyronad is a broadspectrum pyracole –carbox amide fungicide and Fluopyram is a member of the class Benzamide . According to the World health organization all these three chemicals like Fluxapyronad, Fluopyramand Tebuconazole used under best treatment have low acute toxicity via the oral, dermal and inhalation rates of exposure. It is not a skin or eye irritant. Hence this chemical management of two major diseases like Powdery mildew and Alternaria Blight of sunflower is very much needful for farming community.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some recent references must be added in the manuscript in proper way. For eg. In Introduction less references is observed request to add more recentreference in this chapter	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor grammatical mistake is observed along with gap management in the sentence.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Reference of the paper should be alphabetically arranged as an standard format of the journal and overall format of the manuscript should bhe same. For example:  Allen SJ, Brown JF, Kochman JK. Effect of temperature, dew period and light on the growth and development of Alternaria helianthi. Phytopathol, 1983; 73: 893-896.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Madhusmita Katakya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Assam Agricultural University, India</b>