

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125901
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of phyto-extracts for the management of alternaria leaf blight of cluster bean ( <i>Cyamopsis tetragonoloba</i> L.) caused by <i>Alternaria cucumerina</i>
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community because it explores the use of eco-friendly phyto-extracts for managing Alternaria leaf blight in cluster bean, a key crop in arid regions. Its findings contribute to the growing body of research promoting sustainable agricultural practices, reducing reliance on chemical fungicides, and minimizing environmental impact. I appreciate the focus on cost-effective, natural solutions like garlic and neem extracts, which show promise in both disease control and yield improvement. However, the manuscript could be strengthened by a more detailed discussion and clearer presentation of the results.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	I suggest this clearer version of the title, "Evaluation of Phyto-Extracts for Managing Alternaria Leaf Blight ( <i>Alternaria cucumerina</i> ) in Cluster Bean ( <i>Cyamopsis tetragonoloba</i> L.)"	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract summarizes the key aspects of the study, but it could benefit from more structured presentation.  The term "significantly reduced" should be supported with specific statistical results to quantify the impact of each treatment. I suggest this revision, "All treatments significantly reduced disease severity, with garlic clove extract @ 10% showing the lowest disease intensity (29.63%) and highest yield (2.50 t/ha). Neem leaf extract @ 10% provided the best cost-benefit ratio (1:1.80)." This makes the findings clearer and more quantitative.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	While the introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion sections are well-defined, there are a couple of areas for improvement. In the 'Materials and Methods' section, kindly include the formula for calculating the adjusted yield (tons/ha). Additionally, in the 'Discussion,' consider expanding the comparisons with past studies. Highlight both agreements and discrepancies with existing literature to enhance the scientific rigor of your work.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically robust, with appropriate experimental design (Randomized Block Design) and statistical analyses. The findings are technically sound, demonstrating clear reductions in disease intensity and yield improvements across treatments.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The manuscript requires some minor revisions for language clarity. For example, "All the treatments were found significantly reduced the disease severity" could be rewritten as "All treatments significantly reduced disease severity." Ensure consistent use of scientific names (e.g., <i>Cyamopsis tetragonoloba</i> should be italicized). Ensure that references follow the journal required format. Also, improve the presentation of your tables, check the spacing and alignment of tables for better readability.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please ensure that the references are properly cited in accordance with journal style, as well as that they are included.	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Joenil G. Frayco</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>North Eastern Mindanao State University, Philippines</b>