

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_123511
Title of the Manuscript:	Mitigating pearl millet blast (<i>Pyricularia grisea</i>): Effective Fungicidal treatments
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

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)
<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>The manuscript is important for the scientific community, because it brings new information about the control of a fungal disease on a very important crop (millet). It suggests a new mixture of fungicides for a better control of the disease. The first (and very annoying) thing is that the manuscript is written in very poor English, therefore it is difficult to follow and to understand the meaning of the phrases. So, the very first recommendation is to be revised regarding English, by a native speaker or by any corporation that does English checking.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title is very suggestive</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 should be completed, at the very beginning, with information about the culture/plant that was used in the studies, what was the aim of the study (to control <i>Pyricularia grisea</i> by using fungicides), and the conclusions (what combination of fungicides gave best results).</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, they are, but I suggest adding an Abbreviation section.</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>The Introduction also needs English rephrased, but is overall describing why millet is an important plant in India and what are its main diseases. Maybe adding information about other diseases of millet would be interesting and why is millet such an important crop in India. Materials and methods section should be more specified in terms of abbreviations. There should be explained what "a.i." means (Table 1), the formula of disease intensity lacks a term. Also, the last phrase from Materials and methods should be completed with information about how grains quantity and fodder yield was measured. Results and Interpretation section needs to be rewritten in good English. It is difficult to follow the line of the story, when the phrases lack linking words. I would also like to emphasize the lack of explaining the abbreviations (for example: what ICBR, DAS, DNMRT mean?). There are also some abbreviations at the end of Tables 2-6, that should be explained. Therefore, I recommend the authors to add a List of abbreviations to their 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>Only 7 references I believe are quite a few for approaching such a subject. I am pretty sure that there are more experiments on millet, and also on this particular fungus <i>Pyricularia grisea</i>. So, I recommend adding more recent titles to References and including information in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Taking into consideration the above-mentioned facts, I recommend not to accept the manuscript for publication, in the present form, but after major revision and English proof writing.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Gavrilas Oana
Department, University & Country	Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania