

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
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	

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 (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 study addresses the management of Fusarium wilt in field peas using combining neem cake soil amendments with Trichoderma seed treatments, demonstrating superior disease control and yield improvements compared to traditional chemical treatments. This provides farmers with a sustainable alternative to chemical fungicides.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate, informative, and follows scientific writing conventions.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive as it effectively covers the essential elements	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the manuscript's structure generally follows standard scientific paper organization	
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.	Overall, the research follows accepted scientific principles and presents reliable, verifiable results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Add more recent (2020-2024) references on: Current trends in biological control, Latest research on Trichoderma applications and Modern approaches to disease management	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>Inconsistent tense usage Example: "The disease is essentially soil borne and poses a greater problem in management by using fungicides which are uneconomical and their frequent and indiscriminate use often leads to..." Better: "The disease is soil-borne and poses management challenges, as fungicides are uneconomical and their frequent, indiscriminate use leads to..."</p> <p>Many long, complex sentences need simplification Example: "Effects of treatments were evaluated on disease incidence and different growth and yield parameters of field pea under field conditions." Better: "Treatments were evaluated for their effects on disease incidence, growth parameters, and yield under field conditions."</p> <p>Repetitive phrases Example: "under field conditions" appears multiple times. Unnecessary words Example: "present study" (can simply say "this study"). Inconsistent use of commas. Missing hyphens in compound adjectives Example: "eco friendly" should be "eco-friendly". Inconsistent spacing after numbers. Irregular formatting of scientific names</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arnaldo Esquivel FariNa
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional de Asunción, Paraguay