

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_127211
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Fluopyram 250 g/L + Trifloxystrobin 250 g/L SC against anthracnose disease of pomegranate
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
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.	This manuscript is a good study in identifying the better doses of agro-chemicals. Since it is an emerging problem in pomegranate-growing areas in India. The findings will help the growers in determining the doses for spraying during the growing seasons of pomegranate and reducing the yield in return. I like their practical thinking about the problem in the growing field. Methods of setting up the experiment and data collection procedures.	
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.	In the abstract, it is recommended to break up the sentences into simple sentences rather than making extended compound sentences.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. To me, there would be more subsections in the materials and methods section. such as; experimental design, fungicide preparation, data collection, and analysis. there are only two citations in the discussion. that should be more citations on different aspects like these fungicide applications on fruit disease management in a different country.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically sound. They followed the standard method of data collection and analysis. The data is reproducible. However, they used compound sentences to explain the results, so it is not easily readable and understood.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	No, there should be more relevant references. need more references in the introduction section about the use of these chemicals to manage the disease, more references should be added to the discussion	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	it is good, however, it is suggested to use simple sentences to describe the result of the experiment.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The authors should use the bar graph to present the result on PDI, %ROC, and the result of yield and weight loss should be in one table. References should be written in a similar font.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Ferdous-E-Elahi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute, Bangladesh</b>