

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_119774</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Techniques for Isolation, Conidiation and Pathogenicity of Ustilaginoidea virens Isolates (Uv3, Uv4, and Uv15) Causing False Smut Disease in Rice</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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><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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Study is focussed on the false smut of rice, which causes significant losses in non-scented high yielding varieties. Authors have used two rice varieties namely BPT 5204 and TN1 to derive leaf extract. They have found higher conidiation in extracts of BPT 5204 as compared to PSB. This result may serve as a base for future works focused on study of fungal genetics and screening of varieties which requires production of large quantity of inoculum without compromised virulence.</p> <p>2. With few modifications the manuscript can be considered for publication.</p> <p>3. Abstract is poorly written. It must be written by including two lines of introduction followed by Materials and method, result, and conclusion in brief.</p> <p>4. Okay. However, morphological characterization can be a sub heading under the M&amp; M. authors are suggested to add the sub heading.</p> <p>5. Works have been carried out scientifically. And, also molecular characterization part is missing, which is of utmost importance. The author may give the reasons for not including the aforesaid study.</p> <p>6. Most the references added are recent one, that is what expected. Some references are to added. Authors are suggested to see the reviewed manuscript for suggestions.</p> <p>Discussion do not have much reasoning. It does not answer many questions. If the authors have got that result, then they must come up with the appropriate reasons why so? Please see the reviewed manuscript for suggestions.</p> <p>Title of the manuscript can be modified.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Language is comprehensible. However, English can be improved if possible.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lham Dorjee
Department, University & Country	India