

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_102630 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Comparison of post-transcriptional gene silencing (PTGS) strategies for developing transgenic plants resistant to Tomato leaf curl virus (ToLCV) |
| 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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 has a very importance for scientific community, contribute to enforce for production of new strains of tomato plant resistant to ToLCV.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is very suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is perfectly comprehensive but do not is completely in concordance with indicated in text from manuscript.</p> <p>4 The manuscript shown some troubles with orthograph and writing, but the structure and subsections are appropriated. Eg: "...Antisense construct targetting..." "..Replicase is one of the important protein.." "..viral titre.."</p> <p>5. Not. The authors to informs in the abstract:" High degree of resistance was observed in the construct carrying both sense and antisense strand interrupted by intron (ihp). " I do not identified data evidencing it in manuscript. The figure 3 do not evidencing this affirmation. The acceptance of manuscript needs the data that proves the affirmation mentioned in abstract. The manuscript certainly proved that "...transgenic plants with simultaneous expression of sense and antisense strands are more efficient in gene silencing of ToLCV..." but the resistance of this plants against ToLCV do not was proved here.</p> <p>6- The references are out of data and out of standard.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | Yes, but the text must be corrected, | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | The positive fact is the results and data showing the genetic modification were very nice made. | |

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> | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Marcio dos Santos Teixeira Pinto |
| Department, University & Country | Universidade Federal do Tocantins, Brasil |