

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_113265
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of certain plant extracts against the <i>Colletotrichum gloeosporioides</i> causing papaya anthracnose under in vitro conditions
Type of the Article	Short Research 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, because in this article discuss about <i>Colletotrichum gloeosporioides</i> causing papaya anthracnose. Because these diverse fungal pathogens collectively pose challenges to papaya preservation, quality maintenance and marketability. Presently, diverse chemical solutions are utilized to counteract diseases in the papaya industry. But various plant extracts used against <i>Colletotrichum gloeosporioides</i> in papaya and the garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i>) was found to be superior to the rest, exhibiting the minimum mycelium growth (5.30 mm) and the highest percentage inhibition (94.11%) at a 20% concentration.</p> <p>2. Yes, but I want to suggest another title (Evaluation of Antifungal Activity of Plant Extracts against Papaya Anthracnose (<i>Colletotrichum gloeosporioides</i>) under in vitro condition)</p> <p>3. Yes, abstract of the article completely comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate and according to scientific format.</p> <p>5. Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, reference is sufficient and according to citation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications. Because with the use of English language anyone else easily understand article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I think If you add in vivo study in your research article then your research becomes more innovative. But your study is amazing and interesting.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hafiza Ayesha Andleeb
Department, University & Country	Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, The University of Lahore, Pakistan