

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_125317
Title of the Manuscript:	Survey, collection and In-vitro study of the stemphylium blight disease in onion caused by Stemphylium vasicarium
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>REVIEWER'S COMMENTS (Prof. K.R. Aneja)</p> <p>The paper is not suitable for publication due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Abstract is incomplete. > The authors have not consulted the literature properly, it lacks the recent references on the subject (e.g., Horakova, M.K. <i>et al.</i>, 2024, first report of <i>Stemphylium vesicarium</i> causing leaf blight of onion in Slovakia. Journal of plant disease protection 2024). > The some of the references mentioned in the MS have not been given in the reference section. > The methodology used for testing the pathogenicity and proving of Koch's postulates of the <i>Stemphylium vasicarium</i> on onion is not desired, in its place it is better to mention reference in the MS having this information, one such example where this methodology has been given in detail <i>Aneja, K.R. Experiments in Microbiology Plant Pathology Tissue Culture and Microbial Biotechnology 6 Edition, New Age International Publishers, 2023.</i> These are the two basic techniques followed in plant pathology and read/studied by PG Students. <i>th</i> > Characteristics features of the pathogen should have been mentioned in the MS. > The results should have been substantiated with photography of disease symptoms, epidemiology of disease in fields; pathogenicity test; mode of infection in host by the pathogen; colonial morphology, characteristics of conidia and mode of conidial production in the pathogen. > Host-pathogen interaction should have been studied. > The source of fungus identification, classification of the fungus and manual used in the identification, should have been mentioned. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>K. R. Aneja</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Kurukshetra University, India</p>