

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_103060</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Antiviral efficacy of Bacillus sp. against Groundnut bud necrosis orthospovirus in cowpea</b>
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> )

## 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. 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript has made important findings which are helpful for the community</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable and therefore, no need of changing it.</p> <p>The abstract has captured details of every subsection of the manuscript. It is therefore comprehensive. The subsections are well arranged and hence bring out a manuscript that is well structured.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent except for some parts which needs more references to support the work.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of English used is good and fit for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Add page numbers to the manuscript.</li> <li>✓ In the introduction, second and third paragraphs have insufficient references. Consider adding more references to support the work.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Results and Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ On all subsections give attributions to the obtained findings.</li> <li>✓ On Mechanical transmission of GBNV and Pathogenicity review the first sentence to "Samples collected from the field <b>were</b>.....". The first three sentences are not giving out the findings but methodology. Revise them or take to methods.</li> <li>✓ Molecular detection of GBNV in infected Plants is outlining a method other than results and discussion. Take it to materials and methods section.</li> <li>✓ On Efficacy of <i>Bacillus sp</i> on Seed germination and seedling vigour of tomato under <i>in vitro</i>, a repetition has been done in explaining the root length. The second part seems to be about shoot length. Correct it to match the prior stated findings.</li> </ul>	

### 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:	David Musyoki
Department, University & Country	University of Embu, Kenya