

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_123009</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Morphological and Molecular Characterisation of Fusarium wilt pathogen isolated from Sunhemp</b>
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<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)
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.	The topic addressed is interesting, however, it seems to us that the way in which the results are presented has some shortcomings. The objectives of the work are not stated.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	TITLE OK	
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.	avoid using abbreviations	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	-review keywords, -Do not repeat the full name of the pathogen after it is declared for the first time in the text. - Do not repeat information on materials and methods in the results section	
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.	Information is missing from the figure captions. These should be understood independently of the text. There are experiments that are carried out whose objective is not clear (2.1.2. Preparation of giant culture of <i>Fusarium udum</i> f. sp. <i>Crotalariae</i> ). The discussion of the results is insufficient. I also consider that important results for the topic addressed were not presented. For example, the characteristics and distribution of the spores (type) produced in the different culture media evaluated.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	It is suggested to update the references used	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	-	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**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>Mileidy de la Cruz Martín</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>UCLV, Cuba</b>