

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>This article is important as it addresses effective fungicidal treatments for <i>Pyricularia grisea</i> in pearl millet, a crucial step in reducing yield losses, ensuring food security, and promoting sustainable agricultural practices in regions where this staple crop is vital</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>I think the title is suitable.</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 is not well written. I suggest the author to rewrite the abstract by including the brief introduction, objective and recommendation of this research.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>I suggest the author to relook and restructure the flow of this article.</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>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>I personally think that this article lack of discussion and citation/reference from journals or any other sources. Please rewrite and add more discussion to elaborate and support your research findings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English is readable and moderate.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In addition, I couldn't see any graph or charts to portray your findings. All the tables you provided is suitable to be included in appendix. You should be able to include some graphs or charts and also statistical proof referring to your findings. This is more to report than research.</p>	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wan Nur Madihah Wan Abd Halim
Department, University & Country	University College of Agrosience, Malaysia