

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124655
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of neem cake, neem oil and plant extracts on purple blotch of onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) caused by <i>Alternaria porri</i> (Ellis) Cif.
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The study is well-structured with a clear methodology and results section, providing valuable insights into the use of neem-based treatments for managing purple blotch disease in onions. However, several areas could be improved for clarity, precision, and scientific rigor.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title effectively describes the study. However, it could be more concise. Consider revising to: "Impact of Neem Cake, Neem Oil, and Plant Extracts on Purple Blotch Disease in Onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.)."</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract covers the major findings but could benefit by clarifying the result sentence: "The results should that the minimum per cent disease intensity..." (should be "showed" instead of "should"). Further my suggestion is to expand the significance of the results and provide a broader implication for agricultural practices.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Introduction: The introduction provides relevant background information but could benefit from more recent references and additional details about the problem of synthetic pesticide resistance. There are some minor grammatical issues, e.g., in the sentence "Onion is also called as 'Queen of kitchen'." — Consider revising to: "Onion is also known as the 'Queen of the kitchen.'" Expand on the impact of purple blotch on global onion production and the economic implications for farmers.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: The methods are generally well-documented but could benefit from more precision. The preparation of plant extracts is explained well, but additional details on the dilution process and specific environmental conditions during the experiment (e.g., temperature, humidity) would improve reproducibility. It would be helpful to mention why the Nasik red variety of onion was chosen for this study.</p> <p>Results: The results are clearly presented with appropriate use of tables and figures. However, clarify whether ANOVA or another statistical test was used to determine significance and also discuss the variance observed within the data (i.e., why some treatments, such as Neem cake + Eucalyptus leaf extract, performed better than others).</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion does a good job linking the results to relevant literature but could delve deeper into the potential mechanisms behind the observed effects. Consider adding more recent studies to strengthen the argument for using bio-agents over chemical fungicides. Discuss the limitations of the study in more detail, particularly regarding its short duration and the specific environmental conditions in which it was conducted.</p> <p>Conclusion: The conclusion summarizes the results but should better highlight the practical applications of the findings. Address the potential scalability of neem-based treatments for large-scale onion farming and the economic feasibility for farmers.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with a clear experimental design utilizing a randomized block setup, appropriate control measures, and replication. The treatments and methods for applying neem cake, neem oil, and plant extracts are well-documented, allowing for reproducibility. The data collection and analysis, particularly the use of disease intensity percentages and the calculation of bulb yield, are methodologically correct. However, more information on the statistical methods employed (e.g., specific tests for significance) would enhance the rigor of the results. The conclusions drawn align well with the data, supporting the effectiveness of organic treatments in reducing purple blotch disease in onions.</p>	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference list includes relevant studies but should be updated with more recent literature where possible.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally understandable but requires minor revisions to meet the standards for scholarly communication. There are a few grammatical errors, such as missing articles and minor verb tense inconsistencies. These issues can be addressed through light editing and proofreading to improve fluency and clarity. Overall, the content is clear, but refining the language will enhance its suitability for academic publication.	
Optional/General comments	The study offers important insights into eco-friendly disease management for onion cultivation, but the language and presentation could be polished for better readability and scientific clarity. Adding more recent studies and discussing the broader implications for sustainable agriculture would further strengthen the paper.	

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:	Deepika Srivastava
Department, University & Country	Patanjali Research Foundation, India