

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_124845
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro efficacy of different fungicides against leaf blight of Sunflower
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)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it investigates fungicide efficacy against <i>Alternaria helianthi</i>, a fungus that causes significant yield loss in sunflowers. The research identifies Hexaconazole, Tebuconazole and Propiconazole as the most effective fungicides for controlling this disease in vitro. This information can be valuable for farmers and researchers developing strategies to manage <i>Alternaria</i> blight in sunflower crops. I liked that the manuscript included an in vitro pathogenicity test to confirm Koch's postulates. However, it would be even stronger with the addition of in vivo fungicide trials to see how these fungicides perform on actual sunflower plants.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title "In vitro efficacy of different fungicides against leaf blight of Sunflower" is suitable. It clearly states the research objective, focusing on the in vitro evaluation of fungicides against <i>Alternaria helianthi</i>, the causal agent of sunflower leaf blight.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive. It provides a good overview of the research, including the problem statement, methodology, and key findings. However, I would suggest adding a sentence or two to highlight the significance of the study. For example, you could mention the economic impact of sunflower leaf blight or the importance of developing effective disease control strategies.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The sections are well-organized and follow a logical flow, making it easy to follow the research process and understand the results.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound. The authors have used appropriate methodologies and have provided sufficient evidence to support their conclusions. The references cited are relevant and recent, further strengthening the credibility of the research.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references appear to be sufficient and recent. However, I would suggest adding a few more recent studies on the topic to provide a more comprehensive overview of the current research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are a few minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that could be corrected in the revision process.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript is a valuable contribution to the field of plant pathology. The research findings provide important information for farmers and researchers working to control sunflower leaf blight. The authors are encouraged to address the minor revision comments to further improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>The authors have already declared that there are no competing interests. This declaration is important to ensure the objectivity and impartiality of the research.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Aman Verma
Department, University & Country	Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, India