

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_124043
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Salicylic Acid Concentration and Exposure Time on The Surface Fungal Load of Tulip Bulbs
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 <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>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>Summary: The paper investigates the impact of Effects of Salicylic Acid Concentration and Exposure Time on the Surface Fungal Load of Tulip Bulbs.</p> <p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into the use of salicylic acid for managing fungal diseases in tulip bulbs. It is well-organized and provides a clear and detailed analysis. Improvements can be made by clarifying the introduction, providing more detailed explanations in the results and discussion, addressing study limitations, and suggesting future research directions.</p> <p>Overall, the study is well-executed and offers practical recommendations that could benefit the ornamental plant industry.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The description of SA preparation, bulb treatment, and microbiological analysis is clear. ➤ The methodology is generally appropriate and well-described. ➤ Results are clearly presented with effective use of tables and figures. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ While the introduction references numerous studies, the citations should be reviewed for accuracy and completeness, ensuring that all mentioned studies is appropriately cited. ➤ Fonts and size should be on standard form.(Times New Roman) ➤ There is a lack of discussion on potential limitations of the study. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conclusion in research article is generally not written in bulletins its better to keep short and clear –what is the key findings of your research? ➤ Include additional references to recent studies on the topic to strengthen the background. ➤ Experimental Design: include more information about the control conditions and replicate arrangements to better understand the experimental design. What is Experiment design for this research? CRD <p>Overall Recommendation: The paper is promising and makes a valuable contribution to the field. With some revisions, particularly in the methodology and statistical analysis, it could be a strong candidate for publication.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>		

Review Form 3

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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Pragya Aryal
Department, University & Country	Prithu Technical College, Tribhuvan University, Nepal