

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	

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

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.	This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community as it addresses yellow rust management in wheat, a critical issue for global food security. By evaluating new fungicides under natural epidemic conditions, the study provides practical insights for disease control and yield improvement in high-risk areas. The findings offer essential data for managing resistance and supporting sustainable wheat production.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	for greater clarity and conciseness, a refined title could be: "Efficacy of Fungicides for Yellow Rust Control in Bread Wheat in the Arsi Highlands, Ethiopia"	
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 covers the main aspects of the study, including the objective, treatments tested, study sites, and the general outcomes. However, it could be more comprehensive and impactful with the following suggestions: The objective is currently stated twice, which could be streamlined for clarity. You could briefly mention the importance of yellow rust control in wheat to set the context. The phrase "recommended for registration" appears multiple times. Simplify by stating it once in a concluding sentence about recommendations. Briefly state the significance of the results for farmers and potential practical applications, especially regarding the impact on wheat yield and disease management.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the manuscript's structure and subsections are generally appropriate, but some sections would benefit from clearer organization and more consistent use of terminology for readability.	
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.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, as it systematically evaluates the effectiveness of specific fungicides against yellow rust in wheat across multiple high-risk locations. The study design, including the use of standard and new fungicide treatments alongside untreated controls, ensures a comprehensive assessment of each treatment's efficacy. Data on disease severity, yield, and yield components provide a well-rounded view of the fungicides' impact, supporting the validity of the conclusions. Additionally, the use of natural epidemic conditions and multiple test sites adds practical relevance to the findings, making them applicable for real-world agricultural settings.	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are insufficient and many are outdated, with several citations dating back over a decade. To strengthen the manuscript, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies (from the past 5-3 years) on yellow rust management, fungicide efficacy, and wheat disease resistance, particularly in similar agro-ecological regions.	
Minor REVISION comments	no	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Zayneb Kthiri
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Agronomy of Tunisia, Tunisia