

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_114046 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | First Report of the Invasive Pink Pineapple Mealybug, <i>Dysmicoccus brevipes</i> (Cockrell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae) on Sweet flag (<i>Acorus calamus</i> Linn.) in India |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound with new information on the first report of an invasive pest infesting an important economic plant, the Sweet flag.</p> <p>No, I think it should contain more interesting facts. I propose "Pest status, Damage and Biology of an Invasive Pink Pineapple Mealybug, <i>Dysmicoccus brevipes</i> (Cockrell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae) on Sweet flag (<i>Acorus calamus</i> Linn.): First Report in India</p> <p>Yes, but it lacks a sentence on conclusion and recommendation.</p> <p>Section 3.1 – information on the distribution of the pest should be reallocated to the introduction. This section should include only the information on the first report i.e. the last two paragraphs</p> <p>Yes, this manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references are sufficient and a number of them are recent.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes, the English quality is suitable for scholarly communications</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The manuscript is recommended for publication with the minor corrections suggested.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Godfrey H. Kagezi |
| Department, University & Country | National Coffee Research Institute, National Agricultural Research Organisation, Uganda |