

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_109590</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>"Revolutionizing plant virus detection: A review on molecular breakthroughs and their implications"</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<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></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Somewhat</b> 2. <b>Yes</b> 3. <b>Yes</b> 4. <b>Need some figures</b> 5. <b>Yes</b> 6. <b>Yes</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>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1- The researcher did not succeed in clarifying the purpose of this article. Ostensibly, the researcher is trying to prove the efficiency and superiority of modern molecular techniques compared to traditional methods, but he has not succeeded in clarifying the defects of traditional methods (except ELISA)</p> <p>2- When reviewing modern molecular technologies such as NGS, CRISPR, nanopore , etc the description of each method was very brief and does not enable the reader who does not have information about these techniques to understand the mechanism of each technology, which is normal because the article review cannot cover the details of each technique. These techniques have been extensively discussed in many scientific books in terms of their mechanism, their various uses, and a review of the disadvantages and advantages.</p> <p>3- I suggest that the researcher re-write the article in an attempt to clarify the strengths and weaknesses between traditional methods and modern molecular techniques Also, It is preferable to use figures and images to explain how each method works.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Majid Shaii Hamdalla</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institution of Genetic Engineering &amp; Biotechnology for Postgraduate Studies, Baghdad University, Iraq</b>