

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_125464
Title of the Manuscript:	Fungicidal Potentials of Leaf and Bark Extracts of Bryophyllum Pinnatum on Cowpea (Vigna Unguiculata L.) Seed Fungi.
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	The present research may support more research on the active ingredient of the plant for easy use by farmers as alternative to commercial/ synthetic fungicides.	
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 the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	I suggest the author to add the method of screening of antifungal activities. Line spacing and word spacing are to be monitored. Include keywords in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In different segments of the manuscript, the line spacing is not accurate. There are citations and there are details of authors in some paragraph. Sentence alignment issues are also found in the manuscript. Need to explain the method of assessment of zone of inhibition.	
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.	I suggest this research to be published as it was found to be novel and the findings allows others to learn from and expound on the information so that society ultimately benefits	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to make grammatical corrections and scientific corrections	
Optional/General comments	In overall make corrections with line spacing, reference citations, scientific corrections to include the methods of activity.	

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:	B Raja Narendra
Department, University & Country	CVM College of Pharmacy, India