

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_127144
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation and Verification of Fungicides for the control of Yellow rust (<i>Puccinia Striiformis f.s.tritici</i>) in Bread wheat, Arsi highlands of Ethiopia
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>

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.	The study of the evaluation and verification of fungicides for the control of yellow rust in bread wheat is important to assess the performance of all four fungicides to control yellow rust of wheat. The newly verified fungicides are found to be very effective in controlling yellow rust disease for improving wheat yield. This research help in recommendation for registration of as an alternate fungicide Cayunis EC 325 and Tridium to control the wheat yellow rust disease and improving yield.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive, but the corrections marked in the manuscript should be incorporated to enhance clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	
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 conclusion portion has been written in summarized way , follow the style of writing manuscript as per the format of the journal, references should be written in as per the instruction of journal.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please	sufficient	

Review Form 3

mention them in the review form.		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article appear generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are some minor improvement needed for clarity, conciseness and readability will further improve its quality	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript requires thorough revision. The correction marked in the text of manuscript should be incorporated for the improvement of the quality of the manuscript.	

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:	Suman Kumari
Department, University & Country	Bihar Agricultural University, India