

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126444
Title of the Manuscript:	MANAGEMENT OF YELLOW MOSAIC DISEASE IN SOYBEAN
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript addresses an important issue in soybean production by exploring effective management strategies for yellow mosaic disease, a major viral threat to crop yield and quality. The study's focus on integrated pest management using chemical treatments offers potential solutions that could benefit regions where whitefly-transmitted diseases severely impact soybean yields. However, the manuscript lacks depth in its methodological detail and broader contextualization within existing literature, which limits its immediate applicability and scientific rigor. While the research presents promising findings, a more thorough discussion of its implications and comparisons with recent advancements in disease management would enhance its value to the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title, "Management of Yellow Mosaic Disease in Soybean", is somewhat suitable, as it describes the focus on disease management in soybean. However, it could be more specific to reflect the methods or key findings of the study, especially since the research highlights the effectiveness of particular chemical treatments and integrated pest management strategies.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Titles "Chemical and Integrated Management Strategies for Yellow Mosaic Disease in Soybean"</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview but lacks certain details that would make it more comprehensive. Here are some suggestions to improve it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add Specific Objectives: Clearly state the research objective, such as the aim to test the effectiveness of specific chemical treatments in controlling yellow mosaic disease in soybean. This would immediately clarify the study's purpose. 2. Include Key Findings: While the abstract mentions that treatments were effective, it should specify quantitative results, such as the percentage reduction in whitefly populations, disease incidence, and yield improvement. These details would strengthen the abstract by providing clear, measurable outcomes. 3. Economic Impact: Since the study calculates the benefit-cost ratio, summarizing this finding briefly in the abstract would highlight the economic importance of the treatment. 4. Remove Redundant Information: Certain details, such as the protein and oil content of soybean, may be unnecessary in the abstract. Focusing instead on the core results and significance of the findings would make the abstract more concise and impactful. 5. Emphasize Broader Implications: Mention how these findings could contribute to broader pest management practices in soybean or other similar crops. This would help connect the research to a wider context, enhancing its relevance. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript generally follows a standard structure with key sections, including the Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. However, some improvements could enhance its clarity and readability:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: This section could benefit from being divided into two subsections: one for the background on yellow mosaic disease in soybean and another for the study's objectives. This structure would clarify the rationale behind the research and make it easier for readers to follow. 2. Materials and Methods: This section is well-organized but could be improved by adding subsections for experimental design, data collection, and statistical analysis. This would make it easier for readers to locate specific methodological details. 3. Results and Discussion: Combining results and discussion in one section can make it challenging to distinguish between findings and their interpretation. Dividing this section into separate "Results" and "Discussion" subsections, or clearly delineating each part within the same section, would improve readability. 4. Tables and Figures: Ensure that all tables and figures are appropriately numbered and referenced in the text. Adding a caption that describes each figure or table in detail would 	

Review Form 3

	<p>also improve structure and clarity.</p> <p>5. Conclusion: This section should be expanded to include a brief summary of the study's implications for future research and agricultural practices.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically correct in its approach, particularly in designing and implementing a field experiment to address yellow mosaic disease in soybean using chemical treatments. The use of control and multiple treatment groups allows for a clear comparison of effectiveness, and the recorded data on whitefly population, disease incidence, and yield provide a solid basis for assessing treatment outcomes. Additionally, the inclusion of a benefit-cost analysis adds valuable economic insight into the feasibility of the proposed treatments. However, to strengthen scientific robustness, the methodology could be more detailed, particularly regarding the statistical techniques used, which would ensure greater reproducibility and reliability of the findings.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The manuscript's references are limited and lack recent studies, with the most current citation from 2021. To enhance the manuscript's depth and relevance, consider incorporating the following recent studies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> "Molecular characterization of soybean yellow mosaic virus isolates and identification of stable resistance sources in central India" (2023): This study provides insights into the genetic diversity of yellow mosaic virus isolates and identifies soybean genotypes with stable resistance, offering valuable information for breeding programs. Springer Link "A source of resistance against yellow mosaic disease in soybeans" (2023): This research identifies and characterizes soybean germplasm resistant to yellow mosaic disease, contributing to the development of resistant soybean varieties. Frontiers "RNAi-mediated resistance to yellow mosaic viruses in soybean targeting coat protein gene" (2018): This paper explores the use of RNA interference to confer resistance against yellow mosaic viruses in soybean, presenting an alternative approach to disease management. Springer Link "Soybean Resistance to Soybean Mosaic Virus" (2020): This review discusses the mechanisms of soybean resistance to soybean mosaic virus, providing a comprehensive overview of current understanding and potential strategies for disease management. MDPI <p>Incorporating these references will provide a more comprehensive and up-to-date context for the study, aligning it with current research trends and findings in soybean disease management.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article needs improvement to meet scholarly communication standards. While the manuscript conveys its main points, it contains grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and inconsistent terminology that may hinder readability. Issues such as sentence structure, spelling mistakes (e.g., "mosiac" instead of "mosaic"), and redundant phrases detract from clarity and professionalism. Additionally, technical terms should be consistently used, and unnecessary repetition should be minimized. A thorough proofreading and editing process would enhance the manuscript's readability and presentation, making it more suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Overall, this manuscript addresses an important topic in soybean production by focusing on managing yellow mosaic disease, which is highly relevant to sustainable agriculture. The field study design and economic analysis add practical value, making the findings applicable to real-world farming practices. However, to maximize its impact, the manuscript would benefit from a more detailed methodological description, particularly in statistical analysis, and a deeper engagement with recent literature. Additionally, enhancing the language quality and refining the structure with clear subsections would significantly improve readability. With revisions, this study has the potential to contribute meaningfully to the field of plant disease management and pest control in soybean cultivation.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hayam S. Abdelkader
Department, University & Country	Plant Pathology Research Institute, ARC, Egypt