

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124442
Title of the Manuscript:	Distribution and population status of root-knot nematode, <i>Meloidogyne</i> spp. in kharif pulses in zone IIIA of Rajasthan
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it provides comprehensive data on the distribution and population status of root-knot nematodes ( <i>Meloidogyne</i> spp.) in <b>kharif</b> pulses, particularly in Zone IIIA of Rajasthan. The findings contribute to understanding the extent of nematode infestation in mung bean fields, a crucial crop for food security and sustainable agriculture. Additionally, the manuscript highlights the need for integrated pest management strategies in regions where nematode damage is prevalent.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title of the article, "Distribution and population status of root-knot nematode <i>Meloidogyne</i> spp. in kharif pulses in zone IIIA of Rajasthan," is generally clear but could be more specific and engaging. <b>Prevalence and Impact of Root-Knot Nematodes (<i>Meloidogyne</i> spp.) on Kharif Pulses in Zone IIIA of Rajasthan</b>	
<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>	The abstract does a good job summarizing the findings but could benefit from a clearer mention of the study's significance in the conclusion. The abstract briefly mentions the survey and sample collection, but it lacks details about how the samples were processed and analyzed.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<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>	This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by providing a detailed field survey with a clear focus on the prevalence and distribution of root-knot nematodes ( <i>Meloidogyne</i> spp.) in kharif pulses, an important agricultural issue. The sampling methods, such as soil collection and nematode identification techniques, are well-established and appropriate for the study's objectives. The manuscript applies relevant metrics like absolute frequency, density, and prominence values to quantify nematode populations, ensuring the results are grounded in quantitative analysis. While the inclusion of inferential statistical methods could further strengthen the study, the overall methodology and findings are sound, making the research scientifically robust and technically reliable.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Add More Recent References.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The method for soil sampling and nematode counting is clear, but the justification for using a specific sampling size (200 cc soil) could be elaborated.  The results are thorough but would benefit from highlighting key findings directly in the text before referring to the table.  Good comparison with previous studies, but the reasons for regional variation in nematode occurrence need more discussion. In the Materials and Methods section, the temperature mentioned as "100°C" for storing soil samples is incorrect. The typical storage temperature for such samples would be around 4-10°C	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Amal Ibrahim Abdelmaksoud El-Refaiy</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al-Azhar University, Egypt</b>