

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_86648
Title of the Manuscript:	Vacciplant and Calliete cotreatment synergically induces phenolic compounds production in plantain (Musa x paradisiaca L.) and trigger the natural defense activation for protection to black leaf streak disease
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>This study aimed to investigate the synergistic action of two elicitors or stimulators of natural plant defense, vacciplant® and calliete®, on the synthesis of defense metabolites and their impact on tolerance to <i>Mycosphaerella fijiensis</i>, responsible for the black leaf streak disease in banana. This highlights the importance of the study. Overall, the manuscript is relevant and of publication quality. The introduction is well written and covers the main aspects of the study. The material and methods are adequate, the results and discussion are also appropriate, as well as the conclusion.</p> <p>However, I suggest that authors make minor changes to the text before the final version is published.</p> <p>My recommendation is to accept.</p>	Comment accepted and considered

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)	