

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98796
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of "Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus" using conventional PCR and nested-PCR and identification of primer sensitivity through Q-PCR in HLB infected mandarin orange and acid lime plants in Tamil Nadu.
Type of the Article	

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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) 	<p>Yes its an important scientific research on detection of Candidatis Labaribacter asiaticus by different PCR techniques</p> <p>The title should be slightly modified It can be "Comparative analysis of Candidatis Labaribacter asiaticus by different detection methods"</p> <p>Abbreviations were used in the abstract which are highlighted</p> <p>Experiment I and II doesn't look appropriate, comprehensive titles, materials and methods and discussion should be precise.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct but it need to be precise, Figures are not of good quality.</p> <p>References are not in one style.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	English need to be more precise.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Farheen Aslam
Department, University & Country	University of the Punjab, Pakistan