

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125826
Title of the Manuscript:	In Vitro evaluation of Trichoderma species and some selected botanical extracts against Alternaria helianthi (Hansf) causing Alternaria blight of sunflower
Type of the Article	Research 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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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</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.	The research paper presents valuable insights into the use of biological control agents and botanical extracts for disease management. However, the study is limited to in vitro evaluations, which, while useful, represent a more traditional and preliminary approach. To enhance the scientific impact and practical relevance of the findings, it is recommended to conduct in vivo studies. In vivo testing would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the efficacy of these agents under real-world conditions and offer insights into their	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 discussion section is very weak and does not include any references to support or justify your findings. It is important to cite relevant literature to strengthen your arguments. Additionally, the introduction is lacking in depth and needs improvement to provide a more comprehensive background and context for the study.	The manuscript has been updated as per the suggestion.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Only six references are cited throughout the entire research paper, which is insufficient and not acceptable. Additionally, the references provided are outdated. It is recommended to include more recent and relevant studies to strengthen the credibility and validity of the research	The reference list has been updated.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fine	Ok
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	