

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119879
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of selected phyto-extracts for the management of Alternaria leaf spot on mung bean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.) caused by <i>Alternaria alternata</i> (Fr.) Keissler
Type of the Article	can be categorized as a research article.

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1-Yes, the manuscript titled "Evaluation of selected phyto-extracts for the management of Alternaria leaf spot on mung bean (Vigna radiata L.) caused by Alternaria alternata (Fr.) Keissler" holds significance for the scientific community. This study addresses a practical agricultural issue— Alternaria leaf spot, a common fungal disease affecting mung beans. By evaluating different phyto-extracts for their efficacy against Alternaria alternata, the researchers provide valuable insights into potential organic methods for disease management in agriculture. Such research is crucial for sustainable farming practices, offering alternatives to chemical pesticides and promoting environmentally friendly solutions.</p> <p>2-The title of the article, "Evaluation of selected phyto-extracts for the management of Alternaria leaf spot on mung bean (Vigna radiata L.) caused by Alternaria alternata (Fr.) Keissler," is descriptive and informative, but it could be made more concise and impactful. Here's a suggested alternative "Phyto-extracts for Managing Alternaria Leaf Spot on Mung Beans" This title maintains the focus on phyto-extracts and disease management while being shorter and more direct.</p> <p>3-Overall, the abstract effectively summarizes the experimental objectives, methods, results, and conclusions, providing a clear understanding of the study's findings and implications for managing Alternaria leaf spot on mung beans.</p> <p>4-Overall, the manuscript appears well-structured and covers all essential components required for a scientific study. With attention to the suggested improvements, it will enhance readability and clarity for the target audience of researchers and practitioners in plant pathology and agricultural science.</p> <p>5-Based on the information provided and the structure of the manuscript, it appears to be scientifically correct in its approach and methodology.</p> <p>6-While the current references appear sufficient and recent to support the manuscript's scientific integrity, incorporating a few additional references from the suggested categories could further enrich the discussion and ensure the study aligns with the latest advancements in plant pathology, biopesticides, and agricultural economics. This approach not only strengthens the scientific foundation but also demonstrates a thorough review of contemporary literature in the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1 the language and English quality of the article appear to be generally suitable for scholarly communication. Here are some aspects to consider:</p> <p>Clarity and Coherence: The article is structured with clear sections such as Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion, which are typical for scholarly articles. This organization helps in presenting the research findings in a logical sequence</p> <p>Grammar and Syntax: Overall, the grammar and syntax are mostly correct. There are some minor instances of awkward phrasing or punctuation errors, which are common in drafts and can be</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	refined through editin	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript exhibits a strong structure, presenting a well defined introduction, clear methodology, detailed results and an insightful discussion. The use of tables, figures and appropriate references enhances the overall clarityof the content.Additionnaly, the manuscript maintains a scientific tone throughout.	

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:	Rahmani Soraya
Department, University & Country	Hassiba Ben Bouali University, Algeria