

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JSRR_117863
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERIZATION OF ENDOPHYTIC ENTOMOPATHOGENIC FUNGAL ISOLATES: GROWTH DYNAMICS, VIABILITY, DENSITY, AND MORPHOLOGICAL ATTRIBUTES
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only based on '**lac k of No ve lt y**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)		
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title "Characterization of Endophytic Entomopathogenic Fungal Isolates: Growth Dynamics, Viability, Density, and Morphological Attributes" is suitable.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Based on the information you've provided about the research paper, the abstract is likely comprehensive. It mentions the aim (assessing biocontrol potential), the fungi being studied (<i>Beauveria bassiana</i> and <i>Lecanicillium lecanii</i> isolates), and the characteristics measured (growth dynamics, viability, density, and morphology). It introduces the research topic, states the purpose of the study, briefly describes the methodology.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I found this study paper on endophytic entomopathogenic fungal isolates to be very interesting and well written. Here is a list of the most important points: Introduction: Endophytic fungi are good bacteria that live inside plants and don't hurt them. Some endophytic fungi can kill insects (entomopathogenic), which means they could be used to get rid of pests. This study examines growth dynamics, viability, density, and morphological attributes of <i>Beauveria bassiana</i> (Bb) and <i>Lecanicillium lecanii</i> (LI) isolates. Method and Materials: Radial Growth: The width of the fungal colonies was measured over 21 days. To find out how many germs were being made, the conidial density was counted. Spore Germination Test: Evaluated the percentage of spores that germinated over time. Statistical Analysis: To look at the data, Completely Randomized Design (CRD) was used.	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Results and Discussion: Radial Growth: All isolates showed increased colony diameter over time, with NaBb (B. bassiana) exhibiting the fastest growth. Viability of the Conidia: At 24 and 48 hours, NaBb had the most viable spores. Conidial Density: NaBb had the highest number of spores per milliliter, followed by ChBb and KmLI. Conidial Length and Width: Bb isolates (ChBb and NaBb) had longer and wider spores compared to LI isolate (KmLI). The study highlights variations in growth patterns, spore viability, production, and morphology among fungal isolates. These findings are crucial for selecting the most effective fungal isolates for biocontrol applications. The results align with previous studies on growth rates, spore viability, and density of B. bassiana isolates.</p> <p>Conclusion The research provides valuable insights into the characteristics of endophytic entomopathogenic fungi. Understanding these characteristics is essential for developing efficient biocontrol strategies against insect pests using fungal isolates.</p>	
<p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p>	<p>Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound.</p>	
<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions 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, the references appear to be sufficient and recent based on the titles and publication dates you provided. References should be arranged chronologically either following alphabetically or year-wise.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and quality of the English seem appropriate for scholarly discussion based on the information you've given about the manuscript.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sanyogita Shahi
Department, University & Country	Kalinga University, India