

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_116104
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological Characterization of native isolates of Hypocreale fungi <i>M. rileyi</i> from maize fall armyworm
Type of the 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript addresses the diversity of entomopathogenic fungi <i>M. rileyi</i> which is a biocontrol agent for management of fall armyworm. However, it falls short in addressing the rational of the study.</p> <p>Morphological characterization of native entomopathogenic fungal isolates <i>Metharhizium rileyi</i> in maize fall armyworm</p> <p>The Abstract is not comprehensive enough. There is no introduction to the study and conclusion. Yes</p> <p>I find the manuscript false short especially in the methodology. It fails to account what was done and how it was done. The manuscript fails to properly bring out the objectives of the study. The discussion and conclusion need further refinement.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The English could be improved.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tapiwa Mushore</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rhodes University, South Africa</b>