

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121429
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioefficacy of novel chemical fungicides for management of mango powdery mildew
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses a critical issue in mango cultivation—powdery mildew caused by <i>Oidium mangiferae</i> . By evaluating both novel and traditional fungicides, the study provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of new chemical formulations in managing this pervasive disease. The rigorous experimental design and comprehensive data analysis offer practical solutions for improving disease control and reducing yield losses. This work is particularly noteworthy because it highlights the potential of combining fungicides to enhance efficacy and manage resistance, which is crucial for sustainable agriculture practices. I appreciate this manuscript for its thorough approach and practical implications, which contribute to advancing pest management strategies in mango cultivation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Bioefficacy of Novel Chemical Fungicides for Management of Mango Powdery Mildew" is quite suitable as it clearly indicates the focus on evaluating new fungicides for controlling powdery mildew in mangoes.	
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 of the article provides a concise summary of the study's aim, methods, key results, and conclusions. However, there are a few points that could enhance its comprehensiveness: Objective and Scope: The abstract clearly states the problem and objective. It could briefly mention the specific new fungicides tested to give more context. Methods: While the abstract mentions the use of new and old fungicides and the experimental duration, adding a brief mention of the experimental design (e.g., the number of treatments and controls) would provide more insight into the methodology. Results: The results are summarized well, but including a brief mention of how the effectiveness of Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25% WG compares to other treatments beyond just disease reduction percentages could be helpful. Significance: Adding a sentence on the broader implications of the findings for mango growers or for fungicide management strategies would emphasize the practical relevance of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure appears well-organized, with clear and distinct subsections such as Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion, which facilitate a logical flow of information. The Methods section is detailed enough for replication, and the Results are presented clearly with supporting data. The Discussion effectively interprets the findings and situates them within the broader context of existing research.	
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.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous experimental design and comprehensive data analysis. The use of novel and well-established fungicides, combined with a clear methodology for evaluating their efficacy against mango powdery mildew, provides a solid foundation for the study. The statistical analysis of the data is thorough, with appropriate use of controls and replication across two seasons, enhancing the reliability of the results. Additionally, the comparison of new fungicides with traditional ones adds depth to the findings, offering valuable insights into their effectiveness and potential advantages.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references provided in the manuscript include both foundational studies and recent research, which is important for grounding the study in existing knowledge and showcasing current trends. However, to ensure comprehensiveness, consider adding more recent references, especially those published in the last 5-10 years, to reflect the latest advancements in fungicide research and management strategies. This could include recent reviews or studies on new fungicides or integrated disease management approaches. For example, reviewing literature on emerging fungicide technologies or resistance management strategies could offer additional context and support for the findings.	

Review Form 3

	DOI must be mentioned for each reference in the reference list	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are some areas that could be improved for clarity and precision. Here are a few suggestions for minor revisions: Consistency in Terminology: Ensure that technical terms and chemical names are used consistently throughout the manuscript. For instance, use either "Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25% WG" or "Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25% WG" consistently, not both. Grammar and Punctuation: Review sentences for grammatical accuracy and punctuation. For example, the phrase "Among all fungicides tested Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25% WG reduced the disease severity significantly" should have a comma after "tested" to read: "Among all fungicides tested, Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25% WG reduced the disease severity significantly."	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Consider expanding the introduction for more context, providing additional details in the methodology, and enhancing the discussion with comparisons to prior studies. Adding more visual aids and strengthening the conclusion with practical implications could also improve the manuscript. Finally, ensure thorough proofreading for typographical and formatting errors.	

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:	Tayseer Shamran Al-Deresawi
Department, University & Country	University of Wasit, Iraq