

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_85760
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation of Cercospora canescens and Management of Cercospora Leaf Spot (Cercospora canescens) of Mothbean Through Botanicals
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Title of the manuscript is not appropriate. It can be revised as Management of Cercospora leaf spot (<i>Cercospora canescens</i>) of mothbean through botanicals.</p> <p>Most of the places in manuscript, the scientific names are not written properly. Need to write in proper format in italic.</p> <p>Though, the pathogenicity protocol is described in detail in material and methods section, the photograph to support the disease incidence is not clear. It can be replaced with any other good photograph showing disease symptoms clearly.</p> <p>In the results section, the data pertaining to mycelial growth has been transformed using angular transformation technique. This is need to be rechecked. Normally, the angular transformation is used for the data expressed in %.</p> <p>Moreover, the growth of pathogen in control is same at all the three different concentrations. This has to be re-checked. As the each concentration level was evaluated by keeping the control plate separately, the growth of the fungus in all the control plates may not be same.</p> <p>The discussion part is need to be improved. The reason for variation in the inhibition of pathogen by different extracts/botanicals is need to be justified with proper literature support.</p> <p>Conclusion/acknowledgement/conflict of interest part is missing</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Raghunandan, B.L.
Department, University & Country	Anand Agricultural University, India