

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_114774
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacterial diversity of silverleaf whitefly, <i>Bemisia tabaci</i> (Gennadius) collected on jasmine and chrysanthemum
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	<p>Reviewer's comment The manuscript needs a major revision.</p>	<p>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>																																																																																																																								
<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>1. Yes. The manuscript is important for scientific community, with some notes. Its content is fair but the way it is presented is rather unusual. In biodiversity assessment and presentation, discussion about the hierarchy of species is usually a bottom-up instead of top-down process. The manuscript presents a top-down approach of bacterial species, ie. from phylum to class, to order, to family, to genus and species (see the Results and Discussion section and Table 1). Such a top-down approach might be best in an identification process, albeit the classical one, which is not incorrect in itself, but it is less perceptive and may impose interpretational problems.</p> <p>Two ways are then suggested to improve the Results and Discussion section and Table 1. First, it would be better if all subsections (about phylum, class, order, family, genus and/or species; see Results and Discussion section) be combined into one subsection entitled "Bacterial diversity of <i>B. tabaci</i> collected on jasmine and chrysanthemum". Second, to bottom-up the bacterial species hierarchically, it suggested that the original "unusual" Table 1 be changed and revised into more "usual" Table 1 as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="943 1010 2220 1354"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="10">Table 1. Bacterial diversity of <i>B. tabaci</i> collected on Jasmine and Chrysanthemum</th> </tr> <tr> <th>No.</th> <th>Species of bacteria</th> <th colspan="2">Jasmine</th> <th colspan="2">Chrysanthemum</th> <th>Family</th> <th>Order</th> <th>Class</th> <th>Phylum</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td><i>Bacillus cereus</i></td> <td>Nymph</td> <td>Adult</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>Bacillaceae</td> <td>Bacillales</td> <td>Bacilli</td> <td>Bacillicota</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td><i>Bacillus licheniformis</i></td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>Nymph</td> <td>-</td> <td>Bacillaceae</td> <td>Bacillales</td> <td>Bacilli</td> <td>Bacillicota</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td><i>Bacillus pumilus</i></td> <td>Nymph</td> <td>Adult</td> <td>Nymph</td> <td>-</td> <td>Bacillaceae</td> <td>Bacillales</td> <td>Bacilli</td> <td>Bacillicota</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td><i>Bacillus zhangzhouensis</i></td> <td>Nymph</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>Bacillaceae</td> <td>Bacillales</td> <td>Bacilli</td> <td>Bacillicota</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td><i>Curtobacterium luteum</i></td> <td>Nymph</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>Microbacteriaceae</td> <td>Actinomycetales</td> <td>Actinomycetia</td> <td>Actinomycetota</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td><i>Enterobacter hormaechei</i></td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>Adult</td> <td>Enterobacteriaceae</td> <td>Enterobacteriales</td> <td>Gammaproteobacteria</td> <td>Pseudomonadota</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td><i>Klebsiella variicola</i></td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>Adult</td> <td>Enterobacteriaceae</td> <td>Enterobacteriales</td> <td>Gammaproteobacteria</td> <td>Pseudomonadota</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td><i>Microbacterium proteolyticum</i></td> <td>-</td> <td>Adult</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>Enterobacteriaceae</td> <td>Enterobacteriales</td> <td>Gammaproteobacteria</td> <td>Pseudomonadota</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td><i>Serratia marcescens</i></td> <td>Nymph</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>Enterobacteriaceae</td> <td>Enterobacteriales</td> <td>Gammaproteobacteria</td> <td>Pseudomonadota</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td><i>Terribacillus saccharophilus</i></td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>Nymph</td> <td>-</td> <td>Bacillaceae</td> <td>Bacillales</td> <td>Bacilli</td> <td>Bacillicota</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Notes: Nymph = <i>B. tabaci</i> nymph; Adult = <i>B. tabaci</i> adult.</p> <p>The "usual" Table 1 as above can then be used to pinpoint that Yersinaceae (see the Results and Discussion section) does not belong to any taxonomic hierarchy of bacteria above the family level (order, class, or phylum). Yersinaceae is not a bacterial family but a plant family. In fact, it is also clear that Yersinaceae is not the family of either jasmine or chrysanthemum. That means, Yersinaceae has no relevance with the bacterial species being reported in the manuscript, no relevance with <i>B. tabaci</i>, and no relevance with jasmine or chrysanthemum. Based on the "usual" Table 1, it is then suggested that Yersinaceae be deleted from the manuscript (see also the suggested revisions in the manuscript).</p> <p>2. Yes. The title is suitable with a minor note (see the suggestions in the manuscript).</p> <p>3. Yes. The abstract can be comprehensive with a minor note (see the suggestions in the manuscript).</p> <p>4. No. That is why this manuscript needs a major revision (see the above suggestions and those in the manuscript).</p> <p>5. No. (See the suggestions in the manuscript). Please also put and add the site name at least in the methods section.</p>	Table 1. Bacterial diversity of <i>B. tabaci</i> collected on Jasmine and Chrysanthemum										No.	Species of bacteria	Jasmine		Chrysanthemum		Family	Order	Class	Phylum	1	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Nymph	Adult	-	-	Bacillaceae	Bacillales	Bacilli	Bacillicota	2	<i>Bacillus licheniformis</i>	-	-	Nymph	-	Bacillaceae	Bacillales	Bacilli	Bacillicota	3	<i>Bacillus pumilus</i>	Nymph	Adult	Nymph	-	Bacillaceae	Bacillales	Bacilli	Bacillicota	4	<i>Bacillus zhangzhouensis</i>	Nymph	-	-	-	Bacillaceae	Bacillales	Bacilli	Bacillicota	5	<i>Curtobacterium luteum</i>	Nymph	-	-	-	Microbacteriaceae	Actinomycetales	Actinomycetia	Actinomycetota	6	<i>Enterobacter hormaechei</i>	-	-	-	Adult	Enterobacteriaceae	Enterobacteriales	Gammaproteobacteria	Pseudomonadota	7	<i>Klebsiella variicola</i>	-	-	-	Adult	Enterobacteriaceae	Enterobacteriales	Gammaproteobacteria	Pseudomonadota	8	<i>Microbacterium proteolyticum</i>	-	Adult	-	-	Enterobacteriaceae	Enterobacteriales	Gammaproteobacteria	Pseudomonadota	9	<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	Nymph	-	-	-	Enterobacteriaceae	Enterobacteriales	Gammaproteobacteria	Pseudomonadota	10	<i>Terribacillus saccharophilus</i>	-	-	Nymph	-	Bacillaceae	Bacillales	Bacilli	Bacillicota	
Table 1. Bacterial diversity of <i>B. tabaci</i> collected on Jasmine and Chrysanthemum																																																																																																																										
No.	Species of bacteria	Jasmine		Chrysanthemum		Family	Order	Class	Phylum																																																																																																																	
1	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Nymph	Adult	-	-	Bacillaceae	Bacillales	Bacilli	Bacillicota																																																																																																																	
2	<i>Bacillus licheniformis</i>	-	-	Nymph	-	Bacillaceae	Bacillales	Bacilli	Bacillicota																																																																																																																	
3	<i>Bacillus pumilus</i>	Nymph	Adult	Nymph	-	Bacillaceae	Bacillales	Bacilli	Bacillicota																																																																																																																	
4	<i>Bacillus zhangzhouensis</i>	Nymph	-	-	-	Bacillaceae	Bacillales	Bacilli	Bacillicota																																																																																																																	
5	<i>Curtobacterium luteum</i>	Nymph	-	-	-	Microbacteriaceae	Actinomycetales	Actinomycetia	Actinomycetota																																																																																																																	
6	<i>Enterobacter hormaechei</i>	-	-	-	Adult	Enterobacteriaceae	Enterobacteriales	Gammaproteobacteria	Pseudomonadota																																																																																																																	
7	<i>Klebsiella variicola</i>	-	-	-	Adult	Enterobacteriaceae	Enterobacteriales	Gammaproteobacteria	Pseudomonadota																																																																																																																	
8	<i>Microbacterium proteolyticum</i>	-	Adult	-	-	Enterobacteriaceae	Enterobacteriales	Gammaproteobacteria	Pseudomonadota																																																																																																																	
9	<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	Nymph	-	-	-	Enterobacteriaceae	Enterobacteriales	Gammaproteobacteria	Pseudomonadota																																																																																																																	
10	<i>Terribacillus saccharophilus</i>	-	-	Nymph	-	Bacillaceae	Bacillales	Bacilli	Bacillicota																																																																																																																	

Review Form 1.7

<p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>6. Yes. The references are sufficiently recent, but there exists inconsistency between the citations in the text and the list of references, for instance De-Barro <i>et al.</i> (2011)[4] versus Davidson et al (2000). De-Barro et al. (2011)[4] was cited in the text (see Introduction section) but it was not listed in the Reference section. In contrast, Davidson <i>et al.</i> (2000) was listed as No. 4 in the Reference but it was not cited in the text. The citation-reference inconsistency also occurred with the following references (cited in the text but not listed in the References):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Early & Sax (2014) - Lindow & Bradl (2003) - Mason & Rafa (2014) 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>-</p>	

Comment [A1]:

Comment [A2]: Please re-check the reference number.

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>F.X. Susilo</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universitas Lampung, Indonesia</p>