

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129788
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of yield losses for major diseases (late leaf spots) in hot spot location on groundnut ( <i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **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.		
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**

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p><b>Following are the comments and suggestions to improve the clarity, rigor, and presentation of the manuscript.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract is informative but overly detailed. Focus on the most significant findings, such as the yield loss percentages and BCR values, and omit less critical data</li> <li>2. The introduction provides a historical and global perspective but lacks specific context about the severity of the issue in Maharashtra. Adding recent statistics or studies related to LLS in this region would strengthen the relevance</li> <li>3. The manuscript provides a good overview of the study; however, certain sections, especially the "Results and Discussion," are repetitive. Consider summarizing key points to enhance readability</li> <li>4. Several grammatical errors and awkward phrasing reduce the overall quality of the manuscript. For instance, in the abstract, "applications of fungicide sprays impact on the development" could be rewritten as "fungicide sprays significantly impacted the development."</li> <li>5. In materials and methods section, clarify the significance of "gross" vs. "net" plot sizes in the context of the experiment</li> <li>6. The results are clear but can be enhanced with tables and graphs for better visualization, such as a bar graph comparing pod yield and haulm yield across treatments</li> <li>7. References are inconsistently formatted (e.g., some years are followed by commas while others are not). Ensure adherence to a specific citation style (e.g., APA, MLA)</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Neha Sandotra</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Jammu, India</b></p>