



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_50800
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE EFFECT OF FUNGICIDES AGAINST BLAST DISEASE OF RICE
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>)

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	Lines 175-178 must be erased because this concept has been already presented in the introduction. Statement at line 264 is obvious, and has to be erased too. Numbers referring to the literature cited do not correspond to the list reported at the end of the manuscript, and a careful check is needed. The manuscript is written in an approximate English style, and authors demonstrate quite a poor care in several aspects, particularly with tables (table 7 does not exist!) and referencing. I enclose a corrected copy to help producing a more sound and fluent version.	All corrections are done as per instruction.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	A criticism can be raised to the method of identification of fungi contaminating seeds, which implies that fungal species not producing readily recognizable conidia could not be identified.	I will try to study in this regard in my future works.

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)	