

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	

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

	Reviewer’s comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General 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?	<div>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</div>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	R. Dhivya
Department, University & Country	Dr.SNS Rajalakshmi College of Arts and Science, India