

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_115005
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro evaluation of the effects of botanical extract on mycelial radial growth of Alternaria solani.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>1. The manuscript evaluate the potential effects of selected extracts on mycelial radial growth of <i>Alternaria solani</i>. They found that Neem (<i>Azadirachta indica</i>) extract had the higher inhibitory effect. However, the approach is not new and the manuscript presents some weaknesses with respect to the objectives, the methodology, the presentation and discussion of the results, the number and relevance of references. I think the authors should emphasis more on the scientific significance of this study. Accordingly, the manuscript needs to be more carefully written, with introduction, methods, results and discussions presented in a more structured way.</p> <p>2. The title reflect the content.</p> <p>3. The abstract doesn't provide clear description of your research. It should be written in agreement with instructions to authors (Aims/study design/methodology/results/conclusions. Please, add key-words after the abstract.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript agree with instructions to authors</p> <p>5. To some extent.</p> <p>6. The manuscript is poorly referenced. Fourteen references of which only 4 of the last decade. A review including relevant references is required to properly situate your work on the research area, and to highlight the novelty this study represents. Moreover, the reference doesn't meet the forma requirements of JEAI journal.</p> <p>Other comments: - The introduction doesn't provide sufficient background and include little of recent and relevant references. The novelty the study represents and the objectives are not clear. - The statistical methods are not described in M&M section - The result section need to be more focused and concise. -The discussion of the results lacks details and explanations in relation to the obtained results, and this without showing the weaknesses of the experimental protocol. In most sections of the results and discussion, the authors report only results that have already been found in other studies without discussion.</p>	Noted
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	- The manuscript needs language and grammar improvement.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript needs major revision;	

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>	