|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Journal Name: | [**Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology**](https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_JABB\_139771** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Effect of botanical and bio-resources on management of Alternaria leaf spot disease in Stevia rebaudiana (Bertoni)** |
| Type of the Article | **Original Research Article** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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 study is important as it highlights the use of plant extracts as natural and safe alternatives to chemical fungicides for controlling Alternaria alternata. It supports sustainable agriculture and helps reduce environmental harm caused by synthetic pesticides. | According to attachment and comment, correction is done in manuscript |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title is generally suitable as it reflects the main focus of the study on the antifungal effects of botanical extracts against Alternaria alternata.** | No correction needed fro0m reviewer side |
| 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. | The abstract is generally clear and comprehensive. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the methodology used and the significance of the findings for practical applications. Removing minor repetitive details about concentrations would make it more concise. | The correction are done in abstract |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with well-designed experiments and clear presentation of results. The data support the conclusions about the antifungal effects of botanical extracts, especially Azadirachta indica. However, some minor clarifications on statistical analysis and experimental details would strengthen the scientific rigor. | Whatever the correction are made according to attachment |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references cited are generally relevant and cover important prior studies related to botanical antifungal activity. However, some references are quite dated. Including more recent studies from the last 5 years would improve the manuscript’s currency and relevance. For example, recent reviews or research on plant-based antifungal agents and advances in Alternaria alternata control could be added. | Where references that are added in manuscript |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the article are generally understandable but would benefit from careful proofreading and editing to improve clarity, grammar, and flow. Some sentences are lengthy or repetitive, and minor errors in tense and word choice should be corrected to meet the standards of scholarly communication. | Spelling and grammar check is done |
| Optional/General comments | **SEE ATTACHMENT** | Correction are done according to attachment |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |