

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_113046</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of weather parameters on development of powdery mildew of ber (<i>Ziziphus mauritiana</i>) caused by <i>Oidium erysiphoides</i></b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **PART 1:** Review Comments

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	<b>Yes, Because this manuscript provides significant insights into the impact of weather conditions on powdery mildew development in ber, highlighting the importance of temperature and relative humidity in disease management. It reveals critical correlations between disease progression and environmental factors, offering valuable data for crafting effective control strategies. The study enhances understanding of climate resilience in agriculture, aiding growers and researchers in protecting crops and ensuring sustainable production.</b>	

## Review Form 1.7

<p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p>	<p>Yes, it clearly indicates the subject (powdery mildew of Ber), the object of study (weather parameters), and the causal agent (<i>Oidium erysiphoides</i>), making it informative for potential readers.</p> <p>Yes, as it precisely examines how weather affects powdery mildew in ber (<i>Ziziphus mauritiana</i>), a major fruit crop in India, showing a strong correlation between disease severity and environmental factors like temperature and humidity. It finds significant variations in disease susceptibility between two ber cultivars, Gola and Kaithali, with Gola being more affected. The study underscores the importance of weather conditions in managing the spread and impact of powdery mildew on ber production.</p>	
<p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Appropriate to a greater extent but to include a Literature Review segment is a must. Further Recommendation segment has to be followed by the Conclusion.</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

<p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p>	<p>The research is well-structured, following a standard scientific research format, and provides a clear link between the observed data and the conclusions drawn. Here are several aspects that indicate the scientific correctness of the study: <b>Clear Objective:</b> The study has a clear objective to investigate the effect of weather variables on the progression of powdery mildew disease in ber cultivars, <b>Well-defined Methodology:</b> The research methodology is detailed, with a clear description of the experimental design, location, plant materials used, and the methods for assessing disease progression and weather variables, <b>Statistical Analysis:</b> The study employs appropriate statistical analysis methods, including correlation and regression analysis, to evaluate the relationship between weather parameters and disease severity, <b>Results:</b> The results section provides a comprehensive analysis of the data collected, showing a significant relationship between weather variables (such as temperature and relative humidity) and the severity of powdery mildew disease.</p>	
<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>References have to be more on recent research articles, unpublished literature and texts. Further, if Scientific sites have to be referred and stated in the reference.</p> <p><b>References within text:</b> Although references are mentioned, they are not included in the provided text. Ensuring proper citation and including a references section is crucial for scholarly articles.</p>	
<p>7. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p><b>Consistency and clarity in naming:</b> The article sometimes refers to "ber" as "Indian plum" or "desert apple." While it's useful to provide synonyms for readers unfamiliar with "ber," consistent use of the primary term after initial introduction would avoid potential confusion.</p> <p><b>Scientific names:</b> It's customary to italicize scientific names (e.g., <i>Ziziphus mauritiana</i>, <i>Oidium erysiphoides</i>). This not only follows scientific convention but also helps distinguish these terms from the rest of the text.</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

	<p><b><u>Data presentation:</u></b> The description of results and data is clear, but the text could benefit from more concise presentation of key findings or by highlighting the most significant results for easier comprehension.</p> <p><b><u>Statistical analysis section:</u></b> This section is well-detailed but might be improved with a brief explanation of why specific statistical methods were chosen, to aid readers less familiar with statistical analysis.</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article is scientifically written with a level of English suitable for scholarly communications. The language is formal, and terminology specific to the field of plant pathology and agricultural science is appropriately used.</p> <p><b><u>Grammar and syntax:</u></b> There are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings throughout the text. For example, "In the study, which was carried out on two ber cultivars viz., Gola and Kaithali, the disease progression..." could be more clearly written as "The study, carried out on two ber cultivars, Gola and Kaithali, showed that disease progression..." Removing "viz.," simplifies the sentence, and adjusting the structure improves readability.</p> <p><b><u>Use of abbreviations:</u></b> After first introducing an abbreviation, the article should consistently use it. For example, "relative humidity (RH)" could be followed by using "RH" throughout the rest of the document instead of flipping between the abbreviation and the full term.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>The article is suitably written for a scientific audience, with a few areas for improvement in terms of clarity, consistency, and grammatical precision. Enhancing these aspects would make the paper even more accessible and professionally polished.</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Suduweli Kondage Lathisha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sri Lanka Institute of Tourism &amp; Hotel Management, Sri Lanka</b>