

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103060
Title of the Manuscript:	Antiviral efficacy of Bacillus sp. against Groundnut bud necrosis orthotospovirus in cowpea
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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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)	1. Yes this article is very useful for the scientific community because it evokes a viral problem that affects tomatoes, a way towards management 2. Yes 3. Some missing details in the method used 4. A separation between the presentation of the results and the discussion part 5. Yes but with minor corrections 6. References must be updated	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes	
Optional/General comments	I suggest a contraction of the introduction which seems very long, and the separation between the presentation of the results and the discussion part	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Boureima Kagambega
Department, University & Country	Centre Universitaire De Kaya, Universite Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Burkina Faso