

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_96406</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Screening of cluster bean genotypes/varieties for resistance to Xanthomonas axonopodis pv. cyamopsidis using two methods of Inoculation</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Clusterbean [<i>Cyamopsis tetragonaloba</i> (L.) Taub germplasm comprising of 59 varieties were screened for assessing the for resistance to <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>Cyamopsidis</i>. Only one variety RGC-1066 found resistant, 17 were found moderately resistant, 17 were moderately susceptible and 24 varieties were found susceptible to the bacterial blight disease.</p> <p>2. <b>Title needs to be amended</b></p> <p>3. <b>The Abstract sufficiently summarizes the work.</b></p> <p>4. <b>subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</b></p> <p>5. <b>the manuscript is scientifically correct</b></p> <p>6. <b>The references sufficient and recent but more recent references could be added</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The authors have stated that they have used two methods of the inoculation, however there is no mention of the effect or data pertaining to two different method.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The language needs to be improved (for example the abstract is given)</p> <p>Clusterbean [<i>Cyamopsis tetragonaloba</i> (L.) Taub is an arid and semi-arid legume crop belonging to the family <i>Leguminaceae</i>. It is a drought enduring leguminous crop because of its profound tap rooting system and has high capability to get well from water stress. <b>A total of fifty-nine varieties/genotypes</b> of clusterbean were screened under artificial Inoculation field conditions at <b>the</b> College Research Farm, College of Agriculture, Bikaner against bacterial blight disease during the <i>kharif</i> season of 2018 and 2019. <b>The screening for</b> resistance against <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>cyamopsidis</i> bacterial blight infection <b>was done by using</b> two different methods of inoculation viz., seed inoculation and foliar sprays of bacterial suspension (<math>2.5 \times 10^8</math> cfu/ml). Out of 59 varieties, only one variety RGC-1066 <b>was</b> resistant <b>to</b> bacterial blight disease, 17 were found moderately resistant, 17 were moderately susceptible and 24 varieties were found <b>to be</b> susceptible. <b>None of the</b> variety was found <b>to be</b> highly susceptible <b>to</b> bacterial blight.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	M M V Baig
Department, University & Country	Yeshwant Mahavidyalaya, India