|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Journal Name: | [**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**](https://journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_JEAI\_139080** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Screening of newer generation fungicides against Alternaria solani causing early blight in tomato under in vitro condition** |
| Type of the Article | **Original 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.** | The work on assessing the optimized pesticides to manage Fungal pathogen *Alternaria solani* is a good and important research to food security and agricultural sustainability. It examines effectiveness and efficiency of fungicides in managing tomatoes a global food crop. This work will really add to scientific knowledge of fungicides usage and how to avoid retention of residues that can harm non target organisms of it include good rationale for study and why it’s unique from what others has done. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | I was confused about what is the definition of “newer generation of fungicides”in this article, this needs to be clearly described, or it can be replace with their most common names in the title, other seems fine |  |
| 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 quite okay, abbreviations need to be well defined though, and I have highlighted this in the main document. |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Methods of analysis did not statistically included, I will say it might put a clause in the paper, but this can be overwritten with large sample size. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Most statements need citations; this has been included in the manuscript. All diseases mentioned need to be cited. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes |  |
| Optional/General comments | The introduction is a bit not flowing well, incomplete or missing words. Table 2 and figure 1 were not referred to in the manuscript. All other comments are in the manuscript attached. I suggest using photos of the morphological of the isolates recovered. I suggest results should be separate from disussion , discussion and conclusion can be together. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s Feedback** (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)* |  |

**Reviewer details:**

**Temitope Ruth Folorunso, Auburn University, USA**