

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
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	

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information on the type of statistical tool used doesn't find any mention anywhere. 2. Frame the Research question adequately and clearly. 3. Validate the relevance of the research in introduction as well as conclusion. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</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>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Result and discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first mention of "DAS" in the manuscript should give the full name, you can use the abbreviations in later mentions 2. In section 4.1.1 "significantly minimum" is incorrect usage. 3. No need to replicate the result in table as well as figure you can omit the table. 4. The bar diagram does not show the exist title in either x-axis and y axis. 5. The bars in the figure should also show error bars so that interpretation of the reliability and precision of the data is easy. 	
<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>Material and method:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe how the "foliar spray" and "soil treatment" experiment was performed so that the future researchers can easily replicate the experiment. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The references of the literature on cowpea does not needs to be emphasized here, reduce its mention in the introduction, more emphasis is to be laid on the pathogen <i>Colletotrichum lindemuthianum</i>. 2. Use more and recent references. 	

Review Form 3

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:	Shailja Rawat
Department, University & Country	Sri Dev Suman University, India