

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_117043</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>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</b>
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	See the attachment	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>COMMENTS            Topic: Needs modification            Abstract: Poorly written            Introduction: Poorly written and required modification            Materials and Methods: Not clearly defined, requires modifications            Results: Poorly written and requires modification            Discussion: Obsolete references, the references should be updated            Conclusion and recommendation absent from the work and should be included</p> <p>Decision: Major Revision</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Simon Okweche
Department, University & Country	University of Calabar, Nigeria