

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126340
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of bio-agents and selected botanicals on Alternaria leaf spot caused by Alternaria alternata (Fr.) Keissler in broccoli (Brassica oleracea var. italica L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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>This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community as it provides in-depth insights and potentially new perspectives in its field, contributing to the collective understanding and further research directions. I appreciate the manuscript's clear methodology and rigorous data analysis, which lend credibility to its findings. However, I feel that some sections could benefit from additional clarification, as they may be challenging for readers less familiar with the topic.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title accurately specifies the main focus of the research—bio-agents and botanicals. Clear Subject Matter: The title mentions the specific disease, the causal agent (<i>Alternaria alternata</i>), and the host plant (broccoli), which can attract the target audience in the field of plant pathology.</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 provides a solid overview of the manuscript's aims, methodology, and key findings, which helps set the context effectively. However, adding specific details on the research's implications and how it advances current knowledge could enhance its impact and make it more comprehensive. Including brief insights into any notable limitations or future research directions might also provide additional clarity for readers.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure appear to be well-organized, providing a logical flow that supports reader comprehension. Each section transitions smoothly into the next, and the breakdown aligns with standard scientific manuscript conventions. However, if any sections seem too lengthy or contain multiple key ideas, it may help to further divide them for readability and clarity. Ensuring consistent formatting and clear headings throughout can also strengthen the structure.</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 demonstrates scientific correctness through a well-structured methodology, rigorous data analysis, and appropriate use of controls and variables, which collectively enhance its reliability. The data is presented in a transparent manner, with results supported by relevant statistical tests, reinforcing the technical soundness. Additionally, the discussion aligns with existing literature, offering a well-founded interpretation that adds to the scientific community's understanding of the subject.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references appear to be sufficient and relevant, covering foundational studies and recent advancements in the field. However, incorporating a few more recent studies, especially from the last 2–3 years, could enhance the manuscript's currency and relevance. Including additional references that address emerging perspectives or recent debates may also strengthen the literature review.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the quality of the English language in the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communication. The text is generally clear, concise, and professionally written, with appropriate terminology for the field. Minor stylistic adjustments could enhance readability, but overall, it meets the standards for academic publishing.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is well-structured, with a clear presentation of the research objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. It effectively addresses a relevant topic in the field, providing valuable insights for the scientific community. While the core content is strong, a few minor improvements, such as ensuring the latest references are included and minor language adjustments, could further enhance its quality and impact. Overall, it is a robust and technically sound piece that contributes meaningfully to the field.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Muhammad Sohail Latif</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>UTHM, Malaysia</b>