

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122330
Title of the Manuscript:	Integrated Management of Foliar Diseases of Mungbean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.) Under Natural Field Conditions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>The central idea of this work is important. Strong experimental data validates the manuscript, which includes an original contribution. It is demonstrated that the scientific arguments are flawless and are fully backed by current references. Because more specific details are available than in past research studies, the reader can completely understand the concept and procedures of the current study.</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>yes</p>	
<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>There was no academic writing style employed during the building of this work. The majority of the scientific requirements (scientific standards) were not considered by the author when preparing, and drafting this manuscript (each section of your work). The authors raise many interesting points, which makes it difficult for the reader to follow their main argument. I recommend that the authors determine what their main argument is and structure their manuscript accordingly. A clearer theoretical stance will increase the quality of the manuscript. The theoretical framework is promising but incomplete. The authors were unable to address the issue of study aims because the original content was so utterly meaningless and disorganized. I could not find a single cohesive concept or strong argument in your manuscript. This work was composed as a rough draft. Also, the discussion that took place was extremely disorganized and useless. Their abstract, introduction, discussion and conclusion were poorly written. The entire subject was disorganized, and I couldn't find almost any organization or explanation that seemed logical. This manuscript has too many structural issues, which makes it hard to follow the argument. This manuscript contains an elaborate literature review, but definitions of the key concepts are needed in the introduction.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The procedures used in the methodology section are erroneous, and not all of the details are supported by any present-day resources.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Unfortunately, the language and sentence structures of this manuscript are at times incomprehensible. There are a number of verbs and phrases that are repeated throughout the text. For a good peer review, the article requires extensive language editing and a complete rewrite. In my opinion, the authors cannot make their current claims without considering their writings.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I suggest accepting this original work with some major adjustments. The introduction did not address all of the research topic's points, and the reference utilized is somewhat old. The technique's part lacks significant information and factual accuracy with references. The procedures employed require additional clarification by describing all of the details. The writer listed all the titles with their findings in the results and discussion section but did not discuss each point independently. Which statistical program was utilized in this study? This study employed the oldest references to support its methods, observations, and discussion. If you have any arguments, please provide statistical evidence to support them. The article's content is filled with numerous awkward sentences. The entire text has a lot of verbs and phrases that are repeated. The reference list is inadequate and out-of-date. The authors also disregarded the conventions of good writing style and research methodology. The findings drawn are not sufficiently backed by experimental data, and the conclusions, experimental work, and related discussion are insufficiently in-depth.</p> <p>There wasn't enough specific information available regarding the effects of every aspect that were evaluated. If the authors could provide more data tables, diagrams, and statistics to back up each of your suggested paths of action, according to me, it would be excellent.</p> <p>The discussion that occurred was also utterly pointless and messy. Your discussion section was not written clearly without grammatical or spelling mistakes. The content is a collection of weak phrases, and the presentation is poor.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the language and sentence structures of this manuscript are at times incomprehensible. There are a number of verbs and phrases that are repeated throughout the text. For a good peer review, the article requires extensive language editing and a complete rewrite. In my opinion, the authors cannot make their current claims without considering their writings.</p> <p>The manuscript needs to better emphasize the relevance of the research and its practical implications. It is unclear what the authors consider their main contribution to the academic literature and what they envisage in terms of recommendations for further research.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Shahira H. EL-Moslamy</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute, City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications, Egypt</p>