



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_47924
Title of the Manuscript:	THE MALOIDEAE (ROSACEAE) STRUCTURAL AND FUNCTIONAL FEATURES DETERMINING PASSIVE IMMUNITY TO MYCOSIS
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The paper is important because it provides information to determine the micromorphological characteristics that confer resistance to fungi in 4 genera of the Apple subfamily.</p> <p>The objective of work is clear and precise. The results are well presented in a clear and simple way to interpret both the text and the figures. A section of Conclusions should be included since they are presented in a lump sum next to the results. They can be conclusive according to the results obtained and at the same time highlight the benefits of using this methodology in the genetic improvement plans.</p>	Thank you for working with our manuscript. The conclusion section is highlighted at the end of the article.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The research is well conducted, presents results of great practical importance since the application of these in genetic improvement plans, allows to accelerate the selection processes and obtain varieties of greater health and consequently yield. The presentation of the paper should be revised since Results and discussion is very broad, perhaps its subdivision and the inclusion of the conclusions facilitates the reading of it.</p>	Thank you for your comment, some of the results and discussion are converted into a conclusion section according to your recommendations.
<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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	