

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_129934
Title of the Manuscript:	Inventory of parasitic nematodes associated with cotton in Burkina Faso
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 <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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	By understanding and cataloguing the species of parasitic nematodes, researchers can identify which nematodes are most damaging to cotton crops. This will help in determining the extent of yeild losses caused by nematodes. Knowing specific nematodes present enables the development of targeted and more effective control strategies such as use of resistant varieties or appropriate nematicides. The manuscript will enable to design suitable sustainable IPM programs that minimize chemical usage. Farmers can adopt better cultivation practices improving soil health. The inventory contributes to understanding soil biodiversity and ecological interactions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Minor change as suggested in reviewed requires	
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.	Yes, comprehensive but required some modifications. I gsuggest Required modifications in the review report	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes. There is 83 p.c. of correctionness of writing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references are sufficient	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There is 7 p.c. of plagiarism. The authors need to reduce this below 5 p.c.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Loukrakpam Bina Chanu
Department, University & Country	Manipur University, India