

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_106931
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Scabdel 70% and Golden Copper 50% Fungicides on Phytopathogenic Fungi Isolated from Guava Leaves
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Abstract need to start with objective of the study. Keywords are not sufficient. Include three more keywords which are most relevant to the study/manuscript</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>1. Fifteen samples of infected guava leaves were collected during the study. Here it is essential to describe the symptoms of infected leaves. 2. Though six different types of fungus have been isolated from the infected leaves, there is no information on morpho and microscopic identification of isolates obtained. All the six fuugus isolates obtained were need not be pathogens of guava. 3. Koch postulates were done for two fungus isolates only. Rest four isolates? 4. Rationality of testing the pathogen against apple is need to be mentioned 5. In discussion part, the stimulatory effect of golden copper on the growth of tested fungus is need to be described 6. Conclusion part is not sufficient. Need to elaborate</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English language has to be improved. There are many mistakes/typographical errors in many places viz.,In introduction, fourth line..... guava considers the most popular fruits, eleventh line..... algal infection incited caused by.....Materials and methods..... 2.1 line no.2 each infected sample was putted in plastic bag.....2.3 pathogenicity test.... Line no. 5.. guava leaves were washed under tape water.....</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>No</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raghunandan B.L.
Department, University & Country	Anand Agricultural University, India