

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126600
Title of the Manuscript:	Eco-friendly Management of Fusarium wilt (Fusarium oxysporum f. sp. pisi) of Field Pea (Pisum sativum L.)
Type of the Article	Original Reseach Article

**General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
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.	Mostly over all correct	Changes was made according to attachment and highlighted in yellow color
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Good	Title of article was according to crop and pathogen, according reviewer's comment it was 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.	Ok	According to reviewer abstract is appropriate
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	Sections and subsection are mentioned with proper numbering
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.	Some spelling is missing	Corrected the spelling such as <i>Peronospora</i> , <i>oxysporum</i> , <i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> and Highlighted in yellow color
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes	There was about 35 references supporting to research paper
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ok	Proper spelling check and grammar check was done
Optional/General comments	Please See Attachment	Correction are done that are mentioned in attachment and highlighted in yellow color

PART 2:

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