

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_129834
Title of the Manuscript:	Incidence, Prevalence, And Identification of Sclerotium rolfsii causing Southern Blight in Tomato Fields of Mysuru District, Karnataka, India.
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Manuscript addresses significant gap in the field and provides new insights that will be great value for researchers and practitioners. There are similar works conducted in other parts of the world/India, but it is unique in the Mysore region of Karnataka. The study tackles the critical issue of southern blight disease in tomato crop.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of the article is concise and reflects the key focus of the study.	
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.	Abstract effectively outlines the study's purpose, methods, results and conclusions, making it comprehensive and informative.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Research question is relevant and based on the clear gap in existing knowledge. Results are presented clearly and conclusions are logically derived.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Recent references (after renaming the teleomorph as <i>Agroathelia rolfsii</i>) are required. Dell'Olmo, E., Senape, V., Zaccardelli, M., Ragosta, G., and Sigillo, L. (2024). First report of <i>Agroathelia rolfsii</i> (syn: <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i>) causing southern blight in <i>Crotalaria juncea</i> . <i>Journal of Plant Pathology</i> . 1-1. Huang, B., Du, J., Huang, J., Zhang, C., He, H., Guo, Z., Yang, Di., Zheng, J., Chen, W., Liu, Q.	

Review Form 3

	(2024). First report of <i>Agroathelia rolfsii</i> causing southern blight on cowpea in China. <i>Plant Disease</i> , 108 (3), 811. Pai, K. N. and Chandra, M. 2023. Morphological and Molecular characterization of <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> associated with Southern blight disease of spine gourd in India. <i>Journal of Mycology and Plant Pathology</i> . 53(3). 255-261.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript uses technical language appropriate for scholarly communications. Key concepts and findings are presented in a clear and concise manner.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Reviewer's comment This is a well-written manuscript that only needs to undergo a few minor changes Page no 2, 15th line – Replace Athelia rolfsii with Agroathelia rolfsii. Page no 6, last line – Replace Athelia rolfsii (Curzi) Tu and Kimbrough with Agroathelia rolfsii (Sacc.) Redhead & Mullineux Page no 8, 5th line – Replace Neighbour by Neighbor Page no 8, under the fig 5: Replace Athelia rolfsii with Agroathelia rolfsii. Page no 8, under the fig 5: Replace Neighbour by Neighbor	

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:	Keshav Narayan Pai
Department, University & Country	Mangalore University, India