

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_130740
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of AVT entries of Roselle (<i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> L.) against Foot and Stem Rot caused by <i>Phytophthora parasitica</i> var. <i>sabdariffae</i>
Type of the Article	

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.	This manuscript addresses a critical issue in <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> (Roselle) cultivation by evaluating varietal responses to foot and stem rot caused by <i>Phytophthora parasitica</i> var. <i>sabdariffae</i> . The findings are valuable for the scientific community as they identify germplasm with moderate resistance, offering practical implications for breeding programs aimed at improving yield and disease resilience.	Mesta or Roselle (<i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> L.) is one of the most important commercial fibre crops after Cotton and Jute. Foot and stem rot is one of the major devastating diseases affecting mesta plants caused by the fungus <i>Phytophthora parasitica</i> var. <i>sabdariffae</i> . The results of present study described the presence of sufficient genetic variation with respect to fungal diseases within the screened germplasm with a wide range of infection per cent. These findings provide a major incentive for breeders to plan a significant breeding program for resistance to diseases.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Screening of AVT entries of Roselle (<i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> L.) against Foot and Stem Rot caused by <i>Phytophthora parasitica</i> var. <i>sabdariffae</i> ," is descriptive but lengthy. A more concise alternative could be: "Evaluation of Roselle (<i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> L.) Varietal Responses to Foot and Stem Rot caused by <i>Phytophthora parasitica</i> var. <i>sabdariffae</i> ."	Corrections were made as per the suggestions.
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 provides a good summary of the study's objectives, methodology, and results. However, it lacks emphasis on the broader implications of the findings. It would benefit from the addition of: A brief statement on the significance of identifying moderately resistant varieties for breeding programs. A mention of how environmental factors were correlated with disease progression to highlight the study's broader insights. Additionally, the abstract could be streamlined by removing less critical details about disease incidence percentages and focusing on the key outcomes.	Corrections were made as per the suggestions.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound and follows appropriate experimental procedures. However, there are areas requiring clarification, such as: 1. The justification for selecting the six AVT entries. 2. Greater transparency in the statistical analysis, particularly the post-hoc tests and p-values used for comparisons. 3. Clearer explanations of the environmental factors influencing disease incidence and their direct impact on yield.	Corrections were made as per the suggestions.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	While the manuscript references foundational studies, many of the sources are outdated (e.g., several from 2007). Adding more recent references, particularly post-2020 studies on disease resistance and <i>Phytophthora</i> management, would enhance the manuscript's relevance. Suggested areas for additional	Corrections were made as per the suggestions.

Review Form 3

	references include: 1. Advances in breeding for disease resistance in Roselle or similar crops. 2. Recent work on <i>Phytophthora</i> epidemiology and control methods.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is generally understandable but requires improvement for scholarly communication. Specific issues include: 1. Redundant phrases and grammatical errors (e.g., "all the above entries has shown" should be "all the above entries have shown"). 2. Awkward sentence structures that reduce readability. 3. Inconsistent terminology (e.g., "moderate resistance" and "moderately susceptible reaction" are used interchangeably without clarification). A professional proofreading step is recommended to enhance clarity and fluency.	Corrections were made as per the suggestions.
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	NO