

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125580
Title of the Manuscript:	FIELD EVALUATION OF SOME BIOFORMULATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT OF ROOT-KNOT NEMATODE, <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> INFECTING TUBEROSE
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 author should add the relevant references in materials and method section	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	MANAGEMENT OF ROOT-KNOT NEMATODE, <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> INFECTING TUBEROSE by using bioformulations under field conditions	
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.	Abstract slightly modify according to the journal guidelines	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	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.	Inside the manuscript many spelling mistakes observed, author should clearly read the manuscript many times	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Include some more references	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayyandurai M
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India