SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Annual Research & Review in Biology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARRB_38157**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EVALUATION OF ANTIFUNGAL ACTIVITIES OF FIVE PLANT EXTRACTS AGAINST DOWNY MILDEW IN MUSKMELON (Cucumis melo L) CAUSED BY Pseudoperenospora cubensis**
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	Data analysis section is missing! A brief explanation on how the data were analysed should be included	
Minor REVISION comments	Your last sentence in the Introduction section "---- management of *Pseudoperenospora cubensi----"* sounds better than what is written in the title. It could be written as; →**Evaluation of antifungal activities of five plant extracts against** *Pseudoperenospora cubensis* (downy mildew) in muskmelon (*Cucumis melo* L) The results in the abstract are not similar as the results stated in the results section. For example, in the abstract, line 24-25: In conidia germination, *S. macrocarpon* were 87, 88, 70 and 62% while that of *T. diversifolia* were 91, 87, 84 and 72% While in the results section line 130-132: *Solanum macrocarpon* was 87, 85, 70 and 62% while that of *Tithonia diversifolia* at same concentrations were 91, 89, 89 and 92%. Subsection 1 is not seen. It just start with 2.0 Materials and Methods Were the hot water extract and plant extract prepared differently? Consider subsections 2.3 and 2.4 and others. If not, wording should be the same to avoid any doubt The subheading in Table 3 should be bold to maintain uniformity or otherwise Line 12: at.four Line 21: ~~Pseudoperenospora~~ *cubensis.* Once the scientific name is already mentioned for the first time, both the genus and species name are written in full like *Pseudoperenospora cubensis.* Other times, the genus name should not be written in full eg *P. cubensis.* Do the same for all other species name as similar mistakes are repeated throughout the text Line 111: ---- marked on the plates ~~was~~ commenced at --- Line 131-132: Check the results stated with what is in the table Line 159: Discussion and recommendation **References**: Make sure all the references in the text are listed in the reference list and vice versa. They should be written in uniform format as per the requirements of the Journal. For example Colluci and Holmes, 2010 is in the text, but not in the reference list!!!	
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.
Kindly see the following link:
http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Prisila A. Mkenda*
Department, University & Country	*Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania*