

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_117538
Title of the Manuscript:	Demonstration on effect of new molecules for management of tikka leaf spot and rust diseases in groundnut
Type of the Article	scientific 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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, as it deals with the control of fungal diseases that cause damage to peanut cultivation throughout the world. 2. No, the title speaks of a new molecule, however, a combination of products already available on the market was made. Title suggestion: Synergistic action of fungicides in the management of tikka leaf spot and rust diseases in peanuts. 3. Yes, the article summary is comprehensive. 4. Yes, all subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Yes, however the conclusion needs to be improved. this must refer to the results found and must not cite other works. 6. The references are recent, but there should be more discussion, including other articles in the discussion. (The objective of the article must be rewritten, since a new molecule is not being inserted but rather a combination of existing products on the market. It should improve the discussion, revise the conclusion of the article. Other information is found in the manuscript)	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Sim	
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:	José Oliveira Dantas
Department, University & Country	Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia de Sergipe, Brazil