

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_128218
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and characterization of pathogen causing fruit rot diseases from Jackfruit
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This research is regarding the Isolation and characterization of pathogen causing fruit rot diseases from Jackfruit. Fruit rot is one of the most important fungal diseases that cause damage to fruits and horticultural crops. This research seems to be important in this pathogenicity and identification of this disease.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. the title could be more scientific. Eg: "Characterization of <i>Agroathelia rolfsii</i> isolated from Jackfruit". The author could also use any other title that includes the pathogen's name so that it could be more crisp.	
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.	Yes. The abstract is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Conclusion could be a bit more comprehensive.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aishmita Gantait
Department, University & Country	Sam Higginbottom University Of Agriculture, Science And Technology, India