

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127246
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of solanaceous plants for resistance and tolerance to widespread begomoviruses in Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
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.	This manuscript talks about the severe infestation of begomoviruses on solanaceous crops which is economically important. In current scenario, begomoviruses are spreading widely, and needs to be paid a lot of attention to, as there are more than 60% losses that farmers are facing. The manuscript also contains real time surveys and scores based on that which is interesting.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Instead of "Screening of solanaceous plants for resistance and tolerance to widespread begomoviruses in Burkina Faso", the particular virus's name would have been better for specification.	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes it looks appropriate	
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.	Scientifically, more validations could have been done. However, this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it start right from finding the problem, till aiming at providing a solution. This is good about the manuscript. Surveys done for random sample collection is unique to this research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are few places, where additional references could be given. Please check the comments in the manuscript for further details.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, but there are general grammatical mistakes, which is corrected in the comment section.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Overall, it looks like a sound research.	

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:	Ananya
Department, University & Country	National Centre for Biological Sciences (NCBS), India