

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_118459</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Efficacy of Chemical Fungicides and Antagonists against Ganoderma lucidum Associated with Mandarin Basal Stem Rot</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <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>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly in the field of plant pathology, mycology, and horticulture.</p> <p>2. Current title is a good at start, but adding more specific details can make readers more engaged and informative for readers. Suggestion: "Chemical Fungicides and Antagonists as Potential Treatments for <i>Ganoderma lucidum</i>-Associated Basal Stem Rot in Mandarin Trees"</p> <p>3. This abstract provide a good overview of the study's objective, methods, and main findings. To make it more comprehensive, consider adding a few details such as mention the significance of basal stem rot disease in mandarin trees and the importance of finding effective treatments.</p> <p>4. Overall, the manuscript's structure and subsections effectively communicate the research findings some minor suggestions can be made: In the Introduction, consider adding a clear hypothesis or research question to guide the reader. In the Materials and Methods section, some subsections (e.g., 2.1 Evaluation of fungicides) could be further divided into smaller subheadings for better clarity. The Future Scope section could be more concise and focused on specific research directions.</p> <p>5. Yes, scientifically manuscript is correct</p> <p>6. References, provided are relevant to the topic, and they cover a range of aspects related to <i>Ganoderma lucidum</i>, basal stem rot, and the use of chemical fungicides and antagonists as treatments. In this paper, the most recent references date back to 2021 (reference 25) and 2020 (references 24 and 3), which is good. However, there are also several references from the 2000s and 1990s, and a few from the 1980s and 1970s. To further strengthen your reference list, you may consider searching for more recent studies (published in the last 5-10 years) that specifically focus on the efficacy of chemical fungicides and antagonists against <i>Ganoderma lucidum</i> and basal stem rot in mandarin trees. This will help to ensure that your study is built on the most up-to-date research in the field.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are Some phrases and sentences are repeated throughout the article, which can be condensed or rephrased for better flow</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shazia Nouren
Department, University & Country	Government College Women University Sialkot, Pakistan