

Review Form 3

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | Advances in Research   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AIR_131138  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | In vitro evaluation of bio-control agents against leaf spot disease caused by Cercospora sp. |
| Type of the Article      | Review Article   |

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.

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

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <b>Reviewer’s comment</b><br>Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review. | <b>Author’s Feedback</b> <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. |   | It serves as the primary means to share original research findings, allowing other researchers to access, review, and build upon new knowledge within a field , contributing to the advancement of science through the process of peer review and publication. |
| Is the title of the article suitable?<br>(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.      |   | Yes  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.  |   | Yes  |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.                              |   | Yes  |

Review Form 3

|   |  |     |
|---|--|-----|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? |  | Yes |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments  | <div>1. Abstract does not summaries the paper in terms of used method, problem address, performance parameters used etc.</div> <div>2. Address the grammatical and type mistakes.</div> <div>3. The results section has limited Evaluation Metrics discussed; lacks in-depth discussion. It does not provide any statistical significance tests to compare the performance of the different models. Figures and tables are not properly integrated in the text.</div> <div>4. Present organization of paper in separate paragraph.</div> <div>5. Compare the performance of proposed scheme with recent existing related schemes and also highlight the future scope in conclusion section.</div> <div>6. The paper has insufficient discussion of potential limitations and lacks summary of key findings and research problem addressed.</div> <div>7.Arrange the references in proper format.</div> <div>8. The limitations of existing works are explained in the related works section.</div> <div>9. The recent year references are updated with the references works.</div> |     |

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? | <u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u> | No  |