

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_117043
Title of the Manuscript:	Survey of Web Blight of Mungbean [<i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilczek.] Caused by <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> Kuhn in major growing district of Rajasthan
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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, This manuscript has important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, title was suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, abstract was comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, subsection and structure of the manuscript was appropriate. Major correction was required.</p> <p>Discussion section need to improve Conclusion section need to insert</p> <p>5. Yes, manuscript was scientifically correct if experiment was done properly.</p> <p>6. Yes. Reference link absent. Many reference need to insert. Give update reference, reference link with DOI number.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	need to improve	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pradip Hajong
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute, Bangladesh