

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105076
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating Developmental Stages and Morphological Characterization of Xiphinema species Juveniles (Nematoda: Longidoridae)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1- The manuscript is important for the scientific community. However, there are some aspects that need to be reviewed and improved in order to establish itself as a scientific report.</p> <p>2- I suggest a minor modification: Exploring Developmental Stages and Morphological Characteristics of Juveniles in <i>Xiphinema Species</i> (Nematoda: Longidoridae)</p> <p>3- The abstract of the article is comprehensive, but attention needs to be given to the adjectives! They impoverish the information.</p> <p>4- The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5- I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. It's important to pay attention to the suggestions provided.</p> <p>6- The references sufficient and there recent references.</p> <p>Suggestions in the comments indicated in the article text.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Erisnaldo Francisco Reis
Department, University & Country	Brazil