



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_27992
Title of the Manuscript:	A new strobilurin group of fungicide for the management of blast disease of paddy
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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. Why references do not appear in consequence in the text? 2. Line78 what is the unit of '200 kg ha⁻¹'? 3. Line79 P2O5 should be P₂O₅ 4. Line94 authors are suggested to use symbols instead of words in the equation. Results and discussion part 5. Authors failed to appraise the field efficacy of pyraclostrobin 100 g/l CS (commercially available as Seltima 100 g/l CS), a strobilurin group of fungicide at different doses against blast disease of paddy under field conditions. 6. Authors are suggested to revise this part to make the discussion more clear. 7. Conclusion part is not qualified, and authors are suggested to add conclusion in this part.	1. References are in sequences now 2. Unit has been modified as kg/ha 3. Correction included as per the suggestion 4. As per the literature, the equation for PDI is as written in the text. I would be grateful if reviewer provide the equation with symbols 5. Necessary modifications have been incorporated in the result and discussion part 6. As mentioned in answer 5 7. Conclusion part is rewritten to give more clarity
Minor REVISION comments	---Reference [4]doi should be deleted, and first letters in paper title are capital letters which is different from other refs. [6] after Raju KS there are two dots. [12]volume font type is different [14] ;is not correct [18][20] there is 'agrivulture'in both journal titles with different writing format [20]lack of page range [21]lack of dot in the end.	All the suggested corrections have been incorporated



SDI Review Form 1.6

	[24]lack of dot in the end. [26] volume font type is different [28]: is not correct [29]: is not correct [30];is not correct	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		