

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_118485
Title of the Manuscript:	Unlocking Natures Secret: Revealing the Culprit behind Maharashtra Papaya Ringspot Disease
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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://www.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The article is written on an extremely important topic for the region. It highlights the problem of infection of papaya plants with a ringspot disease and the prevalence of this infection in the region.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>I consider the manuscript to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>The most references are recent. Although the list includes publications from 1969, 1970, 1986</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The level of English is sufficient for scholarly communications.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>In general, the article makes a positive impression. Since the problem of high and stable harvests in the world remains relevant, the study of the spread of viral plant diseases requires in-depth research.</p> <p>The article indicates the peculiarities of the geographical distribution of the papaya disease and the degree of plant damage. However, it would also be advisable to suggest or consider known ways to reduce the spread of this virus.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khodanitska Olena
Department, University & Country	Vinnitsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University, Ukraine