

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_130315
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Botanicals and Biocontrol Agents Against Leaf Spot and Blossom Blight Pathogen of Marigold: A First Report from Longleng District of Nagaland.
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>

Review Form 3

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.	The work is an excellent contribution to phytopathology which also provides plant interactions to the benefit of man. The active ingredients if isolated can be candidates to general plant pathology finding application in agriculture and ethno botanical medicines and beyond.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes with a minor correction as indicated: Efficacy of Botanicals as Biocontrol Agents Against Leaf Spot and Blossom Blight Pathogen of Marigold: A First Report from Longleng District of Nagaland.	
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.	It is comprehensive. I suggest that the language be checked and corrected. Also, reduce the length of the abstract. Please, do the corrections as indicated that shall enhance your article.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is scientifically correct. However, its language, structure, and presentation needs to be reconsidered before publication.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and just a few are not recent. However, manage your references to ensure that all references included inside the work is included in your list of references and other references in the list of references are inside the work.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Adjust the corrections as indicated in the manuscript and proofread the manuscript again. The language is not of the highest quality.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Forkwa Etienne Yong
Department, University & Country	University of Buea, Cameroon