

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_123022
Title of the Manuscript:	New Discovery Infestation of Root-Knot Nematode Associated With Misai Kucing (<i>Orthosiphon stamineus</i>) in Peninsular Malaysia
Type of the 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)
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.	Study of infections caused by root knot nematodes is very crucial to control them. The nematodes are a major cause of crop losses all over the world. But, their prevention and control is more difficult than other common pests. It is important to identify the reasons for their growth/infestation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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	The scientific methodology followed , experiments conducted and results reported appears scientifically correct except for sentence building, word placement and some minor mistakes of english comprehension. These mistakes are making it difficult to understand the meanings of few sentences withiout rearranging the words or sentences.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are no recent references, ref.no. 5 seems incomplete, ref.no.9 os not in correct format.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are many mistakes in sentence building and word arrangement. Because of this, the meaning of some sentences becomes difficult to understand.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Amit Ashok Chhatre
Department, University & Country	India