

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121451
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF BIOSAKYNE, A FORMULATION BASED ON ESSENTIAL OILS FROM <i>Zingiber officinale</i> FOR SUSTAINABLE CONTROL AGAINST SUGARCANE SMUT DISEASE CAUSED BY <i>Sporisorium scitamineum</i> IN RATOON CROPS.
Type of the 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>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it explores an innovative approach to mitigating the impact of sugarcane smut disease, a major threat to sugarcane production worldwide. By investigating the efficacy of ginger oil as a treatment, the study offers a potential alternative to conventional chemical methods, which could lead to more sustainable and environmentally friendly agricultural practices. The significant reduction in disease incidence and improvement in sugarcane yield and quality demonstrated in the study highlight the practical benefits of this treatment. I appreciate this manuscript for its practical implications and contribution to sustainable agriculture, although I would have liked to see a more extensive analysis of long-term effects and economic feasibility.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</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>yes</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>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive experimental design and rigorous methodology. The use of controlled conditions and multiple replicates enhances the reliability of the results, while the detailed statistical analysis supports the validity of the findings. Additionally, the manuscript provides a thorough review of related literature, contextualizing the study's results within existing knowledge. The use of well-established techniques for assessing disease incidence and crop yield further adds to the credibility of the study. Overall, these factors contribute to a strong scientific foundation for the conclusions drawn in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Objective: The objective is clear, but it would be beneficial to specify the control method used for comparison (e.g., chemical fungicides or untreated controls).</p> <p>2. Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The application times ("15 and 30 days after harvest") could be misleading if the smut disease affects the crop before harvest. It might be more accurate to describe the timing related to the disease lifecycle. o Specify how many replicates were used and the experimental design (e.g., randomized blocks) for clarity. <p>3. Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The results are reported concisely but lack statistical significance data. Indicating statistical significance (p-values) would strengthen the results. o Mention if there were any observed side effects or unintended consequences of using Biosakyne. <p>Linguistic Evaluation:</p> <p>1. Objective: The phrase "natural fungicide based on Zingiber officinale essential oil" could be slightly rephrased for clarity, e.g., "natural fungicide formulated with Zingiber officinale essential oil."</p> <p>2. Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o "Applied at 1500 ppm and 2500 ppm to young sugarcane under natural infestation" could be clearer if rephrased as, "applied at concentrations of 1500 ppm and 2500 ppm to young sugarcane naturally infested with smut disease." o "At 15 and 30 days after harvest" might be better stated as "15 and 30 days post-application" if the application was done after harvest. <p>3. Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ensure consistency in reporting percentages and data. For example, "smut incidence reduced from 20.51% to 8.67%" should be accompanied by a comparison to controls and statistical analysis. 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mustafa Riyadh Mohammed</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Anbar, Iraq</p>