

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_121562
Title of the Manuscript:	MANAGEMENT IN FUSARIUM WILT MANAGEMENT OF CASTOR: EXPLORING THE POTENTIAL OF BIORATIONALS AND NEW FUNGICIDE MOLECULES AGAINST <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> f. sp. ricini
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 (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 is relevant with good content and technology oriented to provide effective treatment combination to manage the fusarium wilt in castor by reducing the plant protection cost by replacing the fungicides with bioartionals	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	NO Management of Fusarium wilt of Castor (<i>Ricinus communis</i> L.) caused by <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> f.sp. <i>ricini</i> with biorationals and fungicides under <i>in vitro</i> conditions	
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.	Yes already corrected and added comments	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Ok	
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.	Yes recent references were added but common corrections yet to be made regarding the scientific names of the pathogen in italics , journal name to be expanded or it to be fully mentioned	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ok	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammatical mistakes were noted and corrections were made and highlighted in between the script with red colour and comments were made in the comment box 2. Pathogen name must be given in the italics 3. Titles of the Tables, Plates and Figures were not appropriate and suggestions were given and corrected 4. In the results and discussion part, comparisons between and among the treatments must be discussed fully , entire section was corrected and mentioned in the comment box 	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vaka Madhuri
Department, University & Country	Acharya N. G. Ranga Agricultural University, India