

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_122829</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Biochemical studies, Impact of weather circumstances and chemical salts against Erysiphe cichoracearum DC, incitant of okra powdery mildew</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> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? Yes, it meets the standard	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	2. Is the title of the article appropriate? It is relevant to the development of the work	
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.	3. Is the abstract of the article complete? YES, publicize the work and its development	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? They meet the purpose of this article	
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.	5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? yes, it complies	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. They are enough for the article	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good job, it is a contribution to the scientific literature	

**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>Jose Manuel Salum Tome</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Catholic University of Temuco, Chile</b>