

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125088
Title of the Manuscript:	Survey on incidence of gummy stem blight on watermelon (Citrullus lanatus) in Karnataka
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research will offer insights into the incidence and severity of stem blight disease in the surveyed location, serving as a valuable reference for future researchers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is well structured	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is well structured according to the article, no further changes are required	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides essential baseline data on the incidence and severity of gummy stem blight in different regions, which is critical for understanding the geographic distribution and impact of <i>Didymella bryoniae</i> . The comprehensive survey across multiple districts offers a solid foundation for future disease monitoring and surveillance efforts. The pathogen isolation and successful fulfillment of Koch's postulates further validate the scientific rigor of the study, confirming the causal relationship between the pathogen and the disease. These factors make the research scientifically robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference must follow same format, there are slight changes in the references, the author must take a look into	

Review Form 3

:		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear, scientifically accurate, and well-structured, making the content easily understandable for scholarly communication. The manuscript effectively conveys the research findings in a precise and professional manner, adhering to the standards expected in academic publications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N.H. Shankar Reddy
Department, University & Country	Kadiri Baburao College of Agriculture and Horticulture, India