Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JABB_122010**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Exploration of Fungal Pathogens Associated with Post-Harvest Diseases of Guava in Prayagraj**
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

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 manuscript presents a comprehensive investigation into the fungal pathogens responsible for post-harvest diseases in guava fruits collected from various fruit markets in Prayagraj. By meticulously isolating and identifying ten different fungal pathogens, the authors have significantly contributed to understanding the microbial diversity affecting guava post-harvest quality.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable	
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 needs to be rewritten if there is no such limit of words in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript requires significant revision before it can be considered for publication in a prestigious journal like the *Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology*.	
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.	**Corrections-** **1.** A pathogenicity test is typically needed in a study like this to confirm that the isolated fungal pathogens are indeed responsible for the observed post-harvest diseases in guava. The pathogenicity test involves inoculating healthy guava fruits with the isolated fungi and observing whether the same disease symptoms develop. This step is crucial for establishing a causal relationship between the pathogens and the diseases, thereby strengthening the study's findings and ensuring the accuracy of pathogen identification. Without this test, it might be challenging to definitively attribute the disease symptoms to the isolated fungi. **2.** Identifying fungal pathogens at the species level based solely on morphological observations is not sufficiently reliable, as many fungi have similar appearances. Molecular techniques, such as DNA sequencing, are typically needed to accurately distinguish between closely related species. Therefore, a molecular study should be incorporated to validate and strengthen the findings of this research. **3.** The discussion is unsatisfactory; if there is no word limit, it should be expanded. Please explore whether these fungi have been previously reported in guava, and clarify whether they cause only post-harvest infections or if they can also infect guava plants during cultivation. Conduct a thorough literature review on this topic. If any of the fungi identified have not been previously reported in guava, you should present them as a new finding. **4**. The figure captions for both figures need revision. Provide detailed explanations for each photograph, including the type of symptoms depicted and which photograph corresponds to which condition. Specify which conidia belong to which fungi in the captions. Additionally, the current images of conidia are unclear; if possible, include new, clearer images with a scale bar.	

Review Form 3

	Their study includes a thorough survey and successfully isolates a significant number of fungal pathogens, highlighting substantial losses. This report could contribute to further research aimed at managing post-harvest losses in guava caused by these fungi.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	There is a reference cited in the Materials and Methods section, Mahesh et al., 2020, which is missing from the reference list. Please include it in the list.	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The manuscript is well-written, with the Materials and Methods and Results sections thoroughly and clearly explained.	
Optional/General comments	If the authors review and incorporate recent publications on this topic, it will be beneficial for their work.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Tanushree Sarkar**
Department, University & Country	**Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, India**