

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_116667
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of some chemical nematicides against Reniform nematode (<i>Rotylenchulus reniformis</i>) on tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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. This manuscript is important in relation to the potential use of several new nematicides as inhibitors of reniform nematode development and their use to improve tomato growth.</p> <p>2. The title is good only less emphasis on the purpose of the research to be carried out. alternative title suggestions: Evaluation of the potential of new nematicides in reducing R. reniformis populations and improving tomato growth under screen house conditions</p> <p>3. The abstract does not describe the whole of the research. Abstracts are usually arranged concisely, where the majority amount to 250 to 400 words only. The content of the abstract itself includes the subject matter, research objectives, research methods, research results, and also conclusions in paragraph form.</p> <p>4. It is necessary to add conclusions from the research results</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. References are adequate</p> <p>Additional suggestions especially in key words: Usually, 3-6 keywords is the ideal number. This number is enough to cover different aspects of your article without compromising clarity.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Already appropriate	
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:	Andrijanto Hauferson Angi
Department, University & Country	State Agricultural Polytechnic of Kupang, Indonesia