

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_122010</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exploration of Fungal Pathogens Associated with Post-Harvest Diseases of Guava in Prayagraj</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **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>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important in the section on fungal diversity as part of the richness of living organisms on Earth. It becomes crucial because once the types of fungi are identified, methods to control them can also be found. Besides being significant for scientific knowledge, this manuscript is also important for farmers or fruit traders, as it raises awareness about the causes of damage to their products. Identifying these pathogens is also important for human health, as it helps avoid fruits contaminated by pathogens.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>The urgency, aim, and novelty of this paper weren't included.</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, but with an added section of conclusion, it will be better</b></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>In my opinion, this manuscript is scientifically sound because it identifies the types of fungi that cause damage to guava fruits. This results in a decline in product quality. The research findings are presented very well. The arrangement of images and tables is excellent. The microscopic images of the fungi are also good and clear in the areas of focus. This is a simple yet highly beneficial study for traders and the community.</b></p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>Some of the references are recent, but some are more than 10 years old. Certain aspects related to species identification based on morphology tend to use older, even very old, references.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall good but the abstract needs to add of short background, the aim of this research. In the introduction of the manuscript has no reason for the research sampling site. As a foreigner, in the introduction, we did not find a description of Prayagraj; what we found was Uttar Pradesh. What is the relationship between these two regions? We also have not seen a thesis statement regarding the urgency of this research. The discussion of the research results is too brief and does not yet reflect the research findings, which have a lot of data.</p>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>Rosyunita</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mataram University, Indonesia</b>