

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>

Review Form 3

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 provides valuable insights into the management of bacterial blight in pomegranate, a critical challenge for growers. The study demonstrates the effectiveness and safety of Isotianil 7% + Fosetyl AI 70% WG, offering practical solutions for improving yield without compromising plant health. I appreciate the thorough methodology and clear results, which are directly applicable to farmers and researchers in horticulture. However, the writing could benefit from more concise language to enhance readability.	
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.	The abstract is clear but can be more focused. It should briefly mention the study's goal, key results (like the significant disease reduction and yield improvement), and practical benefits for farmers. Some details, like exact timing of measurements, can be cut. Adding a line about its role in disease management programs would make it more impactful.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure works well, with clear sections like Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Conclusion. The details in the Methodology are thorough but could be trimmed to avoid repetition. Results and Discussion could be separated for clarity. Adding a stronger focus on the practical impact in the Conclusion would improve it. Tables are fine but could use clearer captions.	
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 robust as it follows a well-defined experimental design (RBD) with appropriate controls and replicates. The data collection is systematic, covering key aspects like disease intensity, yield, and phytotoxicity. Statistical analysis is applied effectively to compare treatments and demonstrate significance. The use of standard scales and methodologies ensures technical soundness, and the results align well with the objectives, making the findings reliable and impactful.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript's references are adequate but could benefit from the inclusion of more recent studies to enhance its relevance.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but some minor revisions could improve clarity and readability.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Minfeng Tang
Department, University & Country	University of Alberta, Canada