

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 (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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important for scientific community specifically for the field of Agricultural science and Botany. This will also enrich the science of Plant Pathology too.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of the manuscript is appropriate.	
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 of the manuscript is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	
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.	The manuscript is meaningfully & lucidly well written, scientifically robust, well & adequately referenced and technically sound. Standard experimental methodology was also used for the purpose.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	All the reference are recent and sufficient to justify the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is meaningfully & lucidly well written, scientifically robust, well & adequately referenced and technically sound. Standard experimental methodology was also used. Hence it is recommended to accept the manuscript as it is.	

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)	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ujjal Kumar Pati
Department, University & Country	India