

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126591
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Pathogenicity and Cultural Characteristics of Fusarium oxysporum f. sp. ricini Isolates from Major Castor Growing Regions of India
Type of the Article	Research 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>
<p>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.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is a well written manuscript. 2. It contains simple but valuable findings for the castor pathologists and breeders. 3. Taxonomists in the field mycology and plant pathology can use the described characteristics of the fungus for identification of new isolates. 4. The results will be useful to expand the knowledge on castor pathology. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is appropriate.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive containing substances of the paper.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author(s) followed standard template in preparing the manuscript. 2. Every sentence is correctly written. 3. Results have been described the results chronologically. 4. Discussion has been well written with sufficient supporting references. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are sufficient and most of these are recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first sentence of the abstract may be modified as shown below: "The present study was undertaken to investigate the pathogenicity and cultural characteristics of 20 isolates of <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> f. sp. <i>ricini</i>, the wilt causing fungus of castor (<i>Ricinus communis</i> L.)." 2. Under section 'Results and Discussion' in 2nd paragraph, 7th line use ' before the word average.an' 3. Overall English quality is perfect. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>To improve the quality of the paper the measures may be taken (optional)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Photographs of the fungal culture and wilt symptoms may be included if available. 2. Was there any influence of cultural characters of the pathogen on pathogenicity? 	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issues in this manuscript

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ismail Hossain Mian
Department, University & Country	Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University, Bangladesh