

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105956
Title of the Manuscript:	Cultural, morphological and molecular characterization of Ustilagoidea virens causing rice false smut in Tamil Nadu
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.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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. Since rice false smut has assumed a major pest status during the recent years, location specific characterization of the disease is a need of the day to formulate it's successful management strategy.</p> <p>2. Yes. The title reflects the study correctly.</p> <p>3. In the abstract, introductory part can be reduced and the molecular analysis part can be more clear focusing on very closely related strains, particularly, whether any co-relation exists with cultural or morphological characteristics.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes. But, not very scientifically discussed. Much work has been done on this aspect in Tamil Nadu during the recent years. Even the similar work with or without molecular characterization has been attempted collecting the strains from similar districts. For example, Navarasu et al, 2022; Nithila et al, 2022 etc. But it has not been cited or discussed. Atleast, there should be a comparison of the result.</p> <p>7. Apart from molecular characterisation, others are just routine work. So, discussion part should be strengthened more to justify the aim of the study. (Research papers may be consulted- Fu et al, 2022.; Savita et al, 2022, Chandrasekhar et al, 2022). Molecular part should be more elaborate and clear in discussion part, with gel photo of the primers showing differential reaction. The cluster formation is not properly discussed.</p> <p>But, the more important part is to specify the objective very distinctly so that it's usefulness can be known. This was somehow lacking in the paper. Therefore, the suggestion is – the paper should be modified in the above lights to give a clear and correct message.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No. Should be modified more correctly with proper sentences.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The research article is systematic in its study and data generation. The DNA sequence of the individual strain is submitted to gene bank to avoid the duplication of work. However, since the work stresses on a particular state Tamil Nadu, all similar work carried out in the state, nationally or internationally claimed, should find a place, either in introduction or in discussion, stating the current findings over others. Thus, this will be a complete research article on the subject.	

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>	<i><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mayabini Jena
Department, University & Country	National Rice Research Institute, India