

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	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)
<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>Yes, this study contributes to the understanding of plant-pathogen interactions and disease epidemiology, making it a meaningful contribution to the scientific community focused on plant pathology, virology, and agricultural research.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable. If you want to change, alternative title suggestions (Identification of the Causal Agent of Papaya Ringspot Disease in Maharashtra, India)</p> <p>Please reword it to make it more concise while ensuring it accurately reflects the main findings of your study.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are not in order. Reference citations in the text should be identified by numbers in square brackets and in the order by which they are cited in the original manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Although your research is of interest, our editorial team believes that the manuscript requires significant revisions to meet the standards for publication. We encourage you to carefully address the comments and suggestions provided below.</p> <p>The introduction should be more focused on the hypothesis of the manuscript. Provide a clear rationale for your study, highlighting the specific problem being addressed and its significance.</p> <p>Figure captions are incomplete and lack statistical analysis. Ensure each figure has a detailed caption explaining the content and significance, including any relevant statistical analysis (e.g., p-values).</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tahir Mahmood
Department, University & Country	The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan