

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_112145 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Screening of Gossypium hirsutum cotton varieties/genotypes for resistance to jassid, Amrasca biguttula biguttula (Ishida) under rainfed conditions |
| Type of the Article | |

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. I suggest the authors to include more cites of researchers in the field related to jassid popuation and resistance index on Gossypium hirsutum cotton varieties/genotypes in similar studies worldwide and comparing that research with their discussion performed in their study. I strongly recommend the review of different literature scientific research. Moreover, I think the authors must expand their introduction, discussion, and conclusion sections accordingly with new literature review that might strengthen their investigation.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes, although I suggest the authors to cite more articles to strengthen their findings.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | None. I think the manuscript is well written and has not typo or redaction errors. | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | I suggest the authors cite more articles related with the methodology they performed; and latter get a better understanding of the conclusions they found in their manuscript, discussing them with more details | |

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) |
|--|---|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Jorge Octavio Virues Delgadillo |
| Department, University & Country | Universidad Veracruzana, México |