

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_105140</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>GENETICAL VARIABILITY AMONG CERATOCYSTIS FIMBRIATA ISOLATES CAUSING WILT DISEASE OF POMEGRANATE</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Article</b>

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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. <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><b>It has the potential to be if the author can work on the comments</b></p> <p><b>The title is ok</b></p> <p><b>The abstract should be re-constructed</b></p> <p><b>The subsections and structure is appropriate</b></p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references used are not sufficient and recent</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>I suggest editing</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The purpose of this study was to confirm the identity of <i>C. fimbriata</i> isolates from pomegranate in Karnataka, as well as to compare DNA sequences of the internal transcribed spacer (ITS-1 and 4 regions).</p> <p>The author clearly understands the concept of what he or she is writing, but the idea is not presented clearly.</p> <p>I'd like to make the following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract should be rewritten.</li> <li>2. The materials reviewed should be updated to include more recent materials.</li> <li>3. Ensure that the method used is clearly presented so that a layperson can understand what is being studied.</li> <li>4. Make certain that the work is proofread to avoid grammatical errors.</li> </ol>	

[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>Oluwafemi Samson Balogun</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Computing, University of Eastern Finland, Finland</b>