

Journal Name:	<a href="#"><u>PLANT CELL BIOTECHNOLOGY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY</u></a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_PCBMB_12320</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EFFECTIVENESS OF DIFFERENT FUNGICIDES IN COMBATING TOMATO POWDERY MILDEW</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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.	The manuscript is important for scientific community specifically for the field of Agricultural science with special emphasis to Plant Pathology and Pest Management. This will also enrich the agronomic practice and economic management of tomato cultivation. The study may also have an impact/prospect on Pesticide formulation specific for tomato cultivation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of the manuscript is 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.	The abstract of the manuscript is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and	<i>The manuscript is meaningfully &amp; lucidly well written, scientifically robust, well &amp; adequately referenced and technically sound and free from plagiarisms. Standard experimental methodology was also used for the purpose.</i>	

technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	All the reference are recent and sufficient to justify the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	<i>The manuscript is meaningfully &amp; lucidly well written, scientifically robust, well &amp; adequately referenced and technically sound and free from plagiarisms. Standard experimental methodology was also used. Hence it is recommended to accept the manuscript as it is.</i>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ujjal Kumar Pati</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>