

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127174
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio-efficacy of Kresoxim methyl 44.3 % SC against late blight of tomato under in vitro condition
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- different concentration of Kresoxim methyl 44.3 % SC at 80 ppm, 40 ppm, 20 ppm, 10 ppm, 5 ppm and 2.5 ppm were evaluated against late blight of tomato under <i>in vitro</i>. 2- The percent inhibition of mycelial growth over control was 67.82 % in PDA plates consisting of 80 ppm Kresoxim methyl 44.3 % SC after 10 days of transferring culture in media. 3- Kresoxim methyl is available in various formulations, including sprays and granules. Most studies on fungicides for late blight disease in tomatoes have focused on their effectiveness, but not on the efficiency of different concentrations. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is good	
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.	I think it is better if the Authors add more review. Also, explain what is food poison technique.??(Rev. for if it used for plant fungus diseases). Also, I think there is specific isolation media for Phytothora , why they did not used it ?. Also , they need to check standard PDA media , they used 40 g of Potato but in general it 200g / litter ?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Good but need more Review	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Among them, late blight is the most important disease of tomato, as its infestation incurred yield loss of 79.47 in NS 501 variety (Kumar et al., 2022) and even up to 100 % (Nowicki et al., 2012) if not controlled at the right time. It is also notoriously known for the Irish famine in the 1840's causing a death of 1 million people and mass migrations from Ireland to the USA and other European countries (Zadoks, 2008). 2- Kresoxim methyl is a type of fungicide used in agriculture to manage fungal diseases in crops. These findings suggest that further research is required to evaluate the fungicide's performance against late blight in field conditions at various dosages 3- Most studies on fungicides for late blight disease in tomatoes have focused on their effectiveness, but not on the efficiency of different concentrations. This experiment aimed to determine the lowest effective concentration of Kresoxim methyl 44.3 % SC fungicide against late blight caused by <i>Phytophthora</i>. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They should to add more review , specially at introduction , material and dictation parts.	
Minor REVISION comments	good	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	It good and useful idea but need more review , and need more applied studies at future .	

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:	Sahar Sharkawy Abdallah
Department, University & Country	Plant Pathology Research Institute, Agricultural Research Centre, Egypt