

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120334
Title of the Manuscript:	Pathogenicity of root-knot nematode, <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> on tuberose (<i>Polianthes tuberosa</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript detailing the pathogenicity of the root-knot nematode, <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> , on tuberose is of substantial importance to the scientific community, particularly those involved in agricultural science and nematology. The research highlights how varying inoculum levels of <i>M. incognita</i> affect the growth of tuberose, which is critical for developing management strategies to mitigate losses in this economically important flower crop. The detailed experimental setup and clear documentation of the nematode's impact at different stages provide a valuable resource for researchers looking to understand or curb nematode-related damages in similar crops. Personally, I appreciate this manuscript for its rigorous methodology and its potential contribution to sustainable agricultural practices, which can aid in the preservation of floral biodiversity and economic stability for farmers specializing in tuberose cultivation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The scientific correctness of the manuscript is reinforced by its methodological rigor and the detailed reporting of the experimental design and results. Conducting the study within a controlled net house environment at Assam Agricultural University ensures that external variables are minimized, allowing for precise assessment of the nematode's effects on tuberose. The progressive scale of inoculum levels, ranging from 10 to 10,000 second-stage juveniles, provides a comprehensive view of the pathogen's impact, enhancing the reliability of the findings. Furthermore, the inclusion of control groups with no nematode exposure establishes a clear baseline for comparing the detrimental effects of <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> . These elements collectively affirm the manuscript's scientific robustness and technical soundness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	There is one reference missing; please refer to the corrected manuscript.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	There are some sections of the paper that resemble research conducted by other authors, which I have highlighted. Please revise and paraphrase these sentences accordingly.	

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:	Cirilo O. Ybañez Jr.
Department, University & Country	Davao Oriental State University, Philippines