

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_113953
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploration on the Mildew Conditions of Cladosporium asperulatum CY-H1, a Pathogenic Fungus on Tobacco Leaves
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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>Yes, because in this article discuss about mildew poses a significant threat to tobacco industry. This study focuses on a strain of Cladosporium asperulatum isolated from moldy tobacco leaves to investigate its growth under different temperature and humidity conditions, aiming to provide a theoretical basis for local prevention and control strategies against this fungus. Basically, <i>C. asperulatum</i> plays a vital role as a prevalent mold in tobacco storage environments and higher initial inoculation concentrations have greater growth. Furthermore, elevated temperatures exceeding 35°C and reduced water activity less 0.77 could serve as effective physical conditions for preventing fungal mildew in stored tobacco leaves.</p> <p>2. Yes, this title is suitable for this article. 3. Yes, abstract of the article completely comprehensive. 4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate 5. Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct and according to scientific format. 6. Yes, reference is sufficient and according to citation.</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>Yes, English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications. Because with the use of English language anyone else easily understand article.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Hafiza Ayesha Andleeb</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, The University of Lahore, Pakistan</b>