

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_128640
Title of the Manuscript:	Incidence of Alternaria fruit rot as a latent postharvest disease in guava ( <i>Psidium guajava</i> L.) in Kerala.
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.	Losses due to the postharvest decay still represent a major concern from an economic point of view. Thus, the result obtained from this study may be useful in planning phytosanitary control strategies from the field to storage, so as to reduce yield loss.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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, it is comprehensive. Addition and deletion not needed.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	i) Page no.2, sub-topic 2.2, line 9: consider italic the word "al". ii) Page no.3, sub-topic 3.2, line 3: Consider removing the symbol hyphen (-) in between the word seven-day-old and adding the letter "s" after the word day. iii) Page no.3, sub-topic 3.2, line 12: Consider italic the word "al".	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	i) Italic the word "Alternaria": Hartevelde, D.O.C., Akinsami, O.A., & Drenth A., (2013) ii) Insert bracket ( ) in the year "1990": White, T.J., Bruns, T., Lee, S. and Taylor, J., (1990) iii) Italic the word "Alternaria" and insert bracket ( ) in the year "1992": Simmons, E.G. (1992)	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language use is clear and concise.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall this is a clear, concise and well written manuscripts. The introduction is relevant and theory based. The authors effectively links their results to existing literature and offer a comprehensive interpretation.	

#### 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:	S.Nimyaola
Department, University & Country	Manipur University, India