

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | <u>PLANT CELL BIOTECHNOLOGY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY</u> |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_PCBMB_12319 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Insights into the roles of Giant Starships of Diversity in Fungal Genomes |
| Type of the Article | Review 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <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. | The manuscript fulfills current needs. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes | |
| 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. | Yes | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes | |
| 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. | This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. All the concepts meet the criteria | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Yes | |
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | If possible, few more current needs can be added | |
| Optional/General 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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Prabhat Dessai |
| Department, University & Country | Dnyanprassarak Mandal's College and Research Centre, India |