

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.	This article is a good research in increasing crop yield for an economically and medically important crop.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is confusing and does not aptly describe the study. The focus of the research is on root-knot incidence vis-a-vis soil type. An alternate title can be Incidence of Root-knot on misai kucing (<i>Ortosiphon stamineus</i>) soils.	
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.	Suggest to describe the study period in months. Provide one statement to provide idea on the nature of misai kucing.	
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 for this part.	This research is simple but effective. Although further research can be suggested in further providing a measure of nematode numbers in sampled roots.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Increase the reference to at least 30. And provide at least 30% references within the last five years.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mark Ronald Manseguiao
Department, University & Country	Davao del Norte State College, Philippines