

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_127210
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio-efficacy and phytotoxicity of novel fungicide Isotianil 7% + Fosetyl AI 70% WG in pomegranate against bacterial blight (<i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>punicae</i>) disease
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>

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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a critical aspect of crop protection against bacterial blight in pomegranate, a disease that significantly impacts agricultural productivity. The research highlights the efficacy of a specific chemical combination, providing valuable insights for sustainable disease management strategies. I appreciate the manuscript for its practical approach, as it bridges the gap between scientific research and real-world agricultural challenges. However, ensuring clarity in data presentation and eliminating redundancies could further enhance its impact and readability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The original title is already informative enough to show the focus of research on the bioefficacy and phytotoxicity of new fungicides in fighting bacterial blight in pomegranates	
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>The abstract is fairly comprehensive, as it provides information on the location, objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions of the study. However, there are areas where improvements can enhance clarity and completeness. Below are some suggestions:</p> <p>Suggestions for Addition:</p> <p>Objective Emphasis: Add a clear and concise statement of the study's primary objectives early in the abstract. For instance: "The study aimed to evaluate the bio-efficacy and phyto-toxicity of Isotianil 7% + Fosetyl AI 70% WG against bacterial blight in pomegranate."</p> <p>Details on Methodology: Briefly mention the experimental design (e.g., randomized block design, number of replications) to provide context about how the study was conducted. Specify how the yield was converted to a hectare basis (e.g., formula or approach).</p> <p>Quantitative Data in Results: Include specific data points (e.g., reduction in disease intensity, percentage yield improvement) to support the claim of higher efficacy and yield.</p> <p>Significance Statement: Highlight the practical implications of the findings, such as their relevance to farmers, industry applications, or policy recommendations.</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Suggestions for Deletion or Simplification: Remove Redundant Details: The repetition of treatment concentrations ("Isotianil 7% + Fosetyl AI 70% WG @ 200 gm per 100 lit. of water and Isotianil 7% + Fosetyl AI 70% WG @ 150 gm per 100 lit. of water") could be simplified after the first</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but The title '3.3 Efficacy of Isotianil 7% + Fosetyl AI 70% WG against bacterial blight disease in pomegranate fruits during kharif 2022' appears twice in the manuscript. It needs to be clarified whether this is intentional or a duplication error.</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>The manuscript appears scientifically robust as it presents a well-defined experimental design with clear objectives focused on evaluating the bio-efficacy and phytotoxicity of a fungicide mixture for bacterial blight in pomegranates. The study spans two consecutive seasons (Kharif-2022 and Kharif-2023), enhancing the reliability of the results through repeated trials over different growing periods. The methodology includes detailed data collection points (pre- and post-treatment evaluations) and comprehensive assessments of both disease intensity and potential adverse effects, which strengthen the scientific soundness. Additionally, the manuscript's findings are supported by practical yield measurements and phytotoxicity observations, demonstrating that the treatments did not exhibit harmful side effects, thus confirming the treatment's safety and efficacy.</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 references provided are relevant and cover foundational as well as recent studies related to pomegranate diseases, the use of fosetyl-AI, and bacterial blight management. However, there is a gap in the inclusion of very recent literature (post-2020) that might offer updated insights or innovative management strategies. Below are suggestions for additional references that could strengthen the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recent articles (2021–2023) focusing on advances in biocontrol agents or novel fungicides for bacterial blight management. 2. Studies on climate impact on disease epidemiology in pomegranate cultivation, particularly during kharif season. 3. Research papers on the integration of host defense inducers with chemical treatments for better disease resistance. 4. Systematic reviews or meta-analyses exploring current trends in pomegranate disease control at the global scale. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are mostly suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is generally clear and uses appropriate technical terms relevant to the subject matter. However, some sentences could benefit from minor revisions to improve fluency, coherence, and readability. Addressing these areas will ensure that the manuscript meets the standards of professional academic writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	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>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:

Name:	Araz Meilin
Department, University & Country	National Research and Innovation Agency, Republic of Indonesia