

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126591
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessing Pathogenicity and Cultural Characteristics of Fusarium oxysporum f. sp. ricini Isolates from Major Castor Growing Regions of India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</b>

## 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 is important to the scientific community as it provides detailed insights into the pathogenic diversity of <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> f. sp. <i>ricini</i> , a significant threat to castor cultivation. The study's findings on the variability in pathogenicity and cultural characteristics among isolates contribute valuable information that can guide the development of targeted management strategies and support resistant cultivar breeding. I appreciate the manuscript's systematic approach to evaluating isolate variability, as it enhances understanding of how environmental and genetic factors influence disease expression.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it's exactly representing the content of the article inside	
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>Abstract looks good. The author may revise it one again for typhographical errors. Foe examples.</b> The spelling error likely occurred with "agent" being mistakenly written as "age", in the key words, <i>f.sp</i> is de italicized, because it is not supposed to be in italics.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, But I feel in the <b>section 2 (materials and methods)</b> , 2.2 Cultural Characteristics of Isolates of <i>F. oxysporum</i> f.sp. <i>ricini</i> is supposed to be comes after pathogenicity, because pathogenicity only done after recording cultural characters of the pathogen <b>It is as follows</b> 2.1 Cultural Characteristics of Isolates of <i>F. oxysporum</i> f. sp. <i>ricini</i> 2.2 Pathogenicity	
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.	There is very less knowledge and research available in castor and the pathogen ( <i>Fusarium</i> sp.) is a very important soil borne pathogen as well. This manuscript will provide further details like cultural characters and virulence of the pathogen will be added data for upcoming scientific community on the particular aspects (crop)	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The authors may consider incorporating more recent references (post-2020) to enhance the currency of the manuscript. This would provide a more up-to-date perspective on the research and align it with contemporary advancements in the field.	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suggest the author to check for typhographical mistakes again to make the manuscript free of typhos..	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the pathogenic variability and cultural characteristics of <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> f. sp. <i>ricini</i> isolates across key castor-growing regions in India. Understanding the diversity in pathogen virulence and growth traits is crucial for developing targeted and effective management strategies for castor wilt, a significant disease impacting yield. However, incorporating recent references would improve the manuscript's relevance by aligning it with the latest developments in <i>Fusarium</i> research and disease management.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>N.H. Shankar Reddy</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kadiri Baburao College of Agriculture and Horticulture, India</b>