

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_125790
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological and Molecular Identification of root-knot nematode, <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> Infecting Pomegranate (<i>Punica granatum</i> L.) in Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India
Type of the 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 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.	This manuscript represents a significant contribution to agriculture and root-knot management. The research conducted and the findings presented have the potential to advance our understanding of root-knot control. The robust methodological approach, thorough data analysis, and thoughtful interpretation of results make this a high-quality and impactful piece of work.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The main title should be revised to reflect the content of the article, so I suggest the following modification: Morphological and Molecular diagnosis of Pomegranate (<i>Punica granatum</i> L.) root-knot nematode caused by <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> in Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India	
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.	The abstract should be paraphrased and focus briefly on the article's results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well organized with appropriate subsections and structure.	
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.	The manuscript presents a well-designed experimental study that closely aligns with established best practices in the field. The theoretical framework is solidly grounded in the relevant literature, and the research questions logically follow from the existing knowledge. The data analysis techniques are appropriate and rigorously applied, and the conclusions drawn are well-supported by the statistical evidence provided. The clear and organized structure of the manuscript, along with the effective use of figures and tables, further enhances the overall scientific correctness and technical soundness of the work.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, the references are rather old and few, so the time sequence must be taken into account when writing the references, as modern references must be available in addition to the old ones.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language requires a simple review, in terms of linguistic and spelling errors, as well as the structure of sentences.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The introduction is good in terms of presenting the scientific background necessary for the reader to understand the topic. However, the writing of the introduction can be improved.2. The materials and methods section needs to be reorganized so that it can be divided into separate subsections that include materials used for testing, programs used, work procedures, etc.3. The discussion needs to be deeper, with more precise and lengthy scientific interpretations of the results obtained, because in its present form, it superficially discusses the results and does not provide a complete scientific explanation. Therefore, considering the discussion is one of the most important parts of the article, it must be given the highest priority and importance. Furthermore, all results whether positive or negative, must be discussed because they greatly support the research.4. The conclusions need to be rearranged and rephrased as the article, in its current format, does not highlight the results obtained.	

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:	Khalid Mohammed Shihab
Department, University & Country	University of Baghdad, Iraq