

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125337
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable application of NATIVO 300 SC fungicide (Tebuconazole 200 g/L +Trifloxystrobin 100 g/L) in the control of brown spot (<i>Bipolaris oryzae</i>) in strict rainfed rice cultivation in Côte d'Ivoire
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Brown spot is one of the major disease of rice responsible for the yield losses. Hence the current study aimed to reduce the disease severity by using the effective treatment as spray under field conditions which will benefit the farming community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Ok	
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.	It is related and ok	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes suitable	
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 material and methods are correct and appropriate to the work related Results and discussion part is good and comprehensive as per the content, tables and figures	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes they are related and newly added ones.	
Minor REVISION comments	Ok but some grammatical and spell mistakes were found	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An in vitro has to be conducted at first with the tested fungicide i.e Nativo 300 SC rather than testing under field conditions 2. Grammatical errors were found 3. Results and discussion part has to be more comprehensive by supporting with field level photographs for more accuracy in the data 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	V. Madhuri
Department, University & Country	ANGRAU, India