

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_128763
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of different fungicides for the management of stem rust (<i>Puccinia graminis</i> Pers. tritici Erikss. & Henn.) of wheat
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: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript addresses an important topic and provides valuable insights into management of rust. The study design is sound, and the data analysis appears robust. However, there are some areas where the manuscript could be strengthened for clarity and impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable.	
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.	The abstract is concise. Some grammatical mistakes should be corrected.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The conclusion succinctly summarizes the key findings, but it could be improved by emphasizing the broader implications and potential future directions for research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The introduction provides a good overview of the topic, but it would be helpful to include more recent references to set the context for the study. All the statements in the introduction need citation. Add more discussion with recent references in the results and discussion section.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is generally well-written, but a few sections contain minor grammatical errors. A thorough proofreading would help improve the flow and readability.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript has potential, but minor corrections are necessary to enhance its clarity, depth of analysis, and overall impact. I encourage the authors to address the above comments and resubmit.	

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:	Bhushan P. Birari
Department, University & Country	Dr. PDKV, India