

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	

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.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the sustainable management of root-knot nematode (<i>Meloidogyne incognita</i>) in tuberose, an economically important ornamental crop. By evaluating the effectiveness of bioformulations, it contributes to the growing body of research on eco-friendly, non-chemical pest control methods, aligning with global efforts to reduce the environmental impact of synthetic nematicides. The findings also offer practical guidance for farmers and horticulturists, promoting the use of bioformulations to enhance plant health and productivity while mitigating nematode infestations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	More suitable title would be "Evaluation of Bioformulations for the Management of Root-Knot Nematode in Tuberose Cultivation"	
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.	Need revision while including impact of the research	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, very short and limited information is given in the methods material and discussion sections	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by employing a well-structured experimental design, specifically the Randomized Block Design (RBD), which ensures the minimization of experimental error and reliable comparison of treatments. The methodology is sound, with appropriate replication and detailed observations of both agronomic (plant height, floral characteristics) and nematological parameters (galls, egg masses, nematode population). The use of bioformulations and proper statistical analysis of the results further supports the validity of the conclusions drawn. Overall, the study adheres to scientific rigor, making the findings robust and applicable to nematode management in agriculture.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Ok, However more recent references should be included	
Minor REVISION comments	Ok	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	All the comments are given in comments box at the manuscript file	

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:	Muhammad Junaid
Department, University & Country	The University of Agriculture Peshawar, Pakistan