

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_104264
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnosis and biocontrol of <i>Sporisorium scitamineum</i> associated with whip smut sugarcane
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.journalajbgmb.com/index.php/AJBGMB/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		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The methodology of the manuscript does not talk about the diagnosis of the pathogen but it is mentioned and written on the title. Rather title the manuscript as: "Identification and Biocontrol of <i>Sporisorium scitamineum</i>"	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	1. The abstract should have no acronyms. PDA should be written as Potato Dextrose Agar. 2. The author should incorporate the comments in the manuscript first, then update the abstract	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	The manuscript lacks important information, like: 1. Having methodologies without citations. The author should show that the methodologies were taken from published papers, and acknowledge the authors of those papers. 2. On Section 2.3 the author should mention what was used to measure the spore sizes 3. Section 2.5: The inoculation by the <i>S. scitamineum</i> and the other prospectively antagonistic fungi should be explained. ie was it done at the same time? How was it done? 4. Section 2.5: The way the inoculation was done should explain if the treatments inhibited the initial growth of the pathogen or it treated the infected sugarcane cuttings. 5. Section 2.5: How did you test if the inoculation of the cuttings with the pathogen was successful? How do you know that the treated sugarcane was actually infected in the first place?	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>6. Section 2.5: Which inoculation method did you use? Also give its reference.</p> <p>7. Section 3.1: The 13 samples: were they of a similar variety or not? What are the vulnerability indexes of the varieties? What was the purpose of collecting 13 sugarcane samples?</p> <p>8. Section 3.1, second sentence (“Nine species were isolated”). The sentence belongs to the methodology section, not the results section</p> <p>9. Section 3.2: What did you use to measure the spore diameters?</p> <p>10. Section 3.2, third sentence (“..... after inoculation on PDA medium for 7 days....”) this belongs to the methodology</p> <p>11. Section 3.2: the range cannot be width and length</p> <p>12. Section 3.2: 1.4µm is too small for a mycelial length, especially after incubating for 7 days, also, especially since the spore size ranges from 5.1 – 13.1µm. Revise the typo</p> <p>13. Section 3.3: Is it 13 isolates or 13 samples? Are these isolates of the same strain or of different strains?</p> <p>14. Section 3.4: Were the sugarcane cuttings from the same variety? If it was different varieties, did they have the same susceptibility index?</p> <p>15. Section 3.4: How did you measure the 90 – 100%? Does this mean the isolates were highly virulent or the sugarcane was very susceptible or the pathogen found favourable conditions.</p> <p>16. Section 3.4: Smut is a systemic pathogen and the delayed exhibition of symptoms does not mean 0 infection. Methods of testing systemic infection include using PCR. For this study, which method did you use to detect the pathogen in the inoculated plants</p>	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes 1.	
<u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>1. In Section 2.4, rephrase “within 3cm length” to “3cm apart”</p> <p>2. The Author should correct the typos throughout the manuscript. I have highlighted most of them in yellow</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is a number of typos that require to be corrected, throughout the manuscript	
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:	Bongani Nkhabindze
Department, University & Country	University of Eswatini, Eswatini