

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Microbiology Research Journal International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_124517
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of neem oil in combination with propiconazole and organic amendments on anthracnose ( <i>Colletotrichum lindemuthianum</i> ) of cowpea ( <i>vigna unguiculata</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research

#### **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)
<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>This manuscript is very important to the scientific world since it explores effective solutions to controlling anthracnose disease, a limiting factor to cowpea yields. It is worth noting that the efficacy of neem oil with Propiconazole as tested gives significant information on sustainable, eco-friendly alternatives to chemical treatment. The study's practical application improves cowpea yield and plant health, mainly under specific agro climatic conditions of Prayagraj. The findings are only limited to one crop season; thus, future research is recommended for validation and generalization of results across different regions and conditions</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Suggested Additions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Research Objective:</b> Clearly state the research aim at the beginning, such as the purpose of testing the efficacy of Neem oil and Propiconazole in controlling anthracnose in cowpea.</li> <li><b>Hypothesis:</b> If applicable, briefly mention any hypothesis that guided the study.</li> <li><b>Key Results in Figures:</b> Include a brief mention of the percentage reduction in disease intensity and specific yield improvements to provide more measurable outcomes.</li> <li><b>Study Significance:</b> You may want to briefly highlight the broader implications of the study for cowpea cultivation and anthracnose control.</li> </ol> <p><b>Suggested Deletions or Modifications:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Redundancy:</b> Avoid repeating phrases such as "significantly reduced disease incidence" or "most effective treatment" without elaborating on how much the reduction was. This makes the abstract more concise and impactful.</li> <li><b>Simplify Terminology:</b> Terms like "VC@10gm/kg + SMC@10gm/kg" should either be explained briefly in parentheses or replaced with more accessible language.</li> <li><b>Condense Experiment Details:</b> The concentration and timing details (e.g., "at 30, 45, 60 and 75 DAS") can be condensed to streamline the abstract, perhaps summarizing that disease intensity was consistently reduced over the growing period.</li> </ol>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound at many levels. The first reason is that it carries out the experiment in a structured manner, including both sets of concentrations of neem oil with Propiconazole against the pathogen <i>Colletotrichum lindemuthianum</i>, leading to infection in cowpea plants. The authors have also described the methods briefly, including pre-harvest and post-harvest incidence of the disease, which makes the results richer. The study, therefore, goes beyond mere evaluation of disease control; it measured agronomic parameters like plant height, yield, and benefit-cost ratio; thus the findings are highly relevant in practice. Lastly, the authors state limitations of the study and recommendations for future research, thus showing a balanced and scientifically cautious view of the findings.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

### Review Form 3

:		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	In this manuscript , it would have been more informative according to betterment for research purpose if author would have also mention Disease intensity % Along with PDC ( Percent Disease Control )	

### **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:	<b>Abhishek Singh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shri Venkateshwara University, India</b>