

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_122889</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Management of pearl millet downy mildew by the application of bio-agents and fungicides</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a critical challenge in pearl millet cultivation—downy mildew disease—by exploring the effectiveness of bio-agents and fungicides. The study provides valuable insights into sustainable and practical disease management strategies that can enhance crop resilience and productivity. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on integrating biological and chemical control methods, which aligns with the growing emphasis on environmentally responsible agricultural practices. This research has the potential to inform future studies and guide farmers in adopting more effective disease management techniques, ultimately contributing to food security and agricultural sustainability.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>		
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>NA</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>There is a minor need to update this manuscript as I have mentioned in the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, though it requires some minor corrections to fully align with the provided comments. The study is based on a well-structured experimental design that appropriately evaluates the use of bio-agents and fungicides in managing pearl millet downy mildew. The methodologies employed are suitable for the research objective. While the manuscript is fundamentally strong, updating it according to the reviewer comments will further enhance its clarity and precision, ultimately reinforcing the validity of the findings.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>Kindly more references to justify your findings</b></p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Suggested in manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Akshit Kukreti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>FRI, India</b>