

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_130135
Title of the Manuscript:	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT OF WILT DISEASE OF SAFFLOWER
Type of the 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 (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 research is important. We can find out the potency of fungicides derived from natural ingredients. It is environmentally friendly natural ingredients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable.	
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, the abstract is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is correct. However there are somethings to be revised 1. In treatment T8-T11, it is written FYM. What is FYM? If it is mentioned for the first time, write the full name. It can be abbreviated after that. 2. What type of further statistical test is used in the manuscript when F test is significant? Tukey's test, etc? The discussion should be based on such further test.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Old references. Suggestion: 1. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S240584402405062X 2. https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1755-1315/886/1/012123/meta 3. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10921932/ 4. https://smujo.id/psnmbi/article/view/2596	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable	
Optional/General comments	Needs several revisions but it is worthy to be published	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tri Wardhani
Department, University & Country	University of Widya Gama, Indonesia