

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_121938
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on the Prevalence of bacterial leaf blight of rice in Andhra Pradesh and invitro evaluation of silver and copper nanoparticles against Xanthomonas oryzae pv. oryzae
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>Likes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Clarity and Specificity: The abstract clearly outlines the survey's objectives, methodology, and findings, making it easy to understand the scope and significance of the research. <input type="checkbox"/> Quantitative Data: The use of specific percentages and disease indices provides concrete data that strengthens the abstract and makes the findings more compelling. <input type="checkbox"/> Comparative Analysis: The comparison of antimicrobial activity between silver and copper nanoparticles adds depth to the study, highlighting the practical implications of the findings. <input type="checkbox"/> Geographical Specificity: Mentioning specific locations (e.g., Chinta Reddy Palem village in Nellore district) gives the study regional relevance and contextualizes the data. <p>Dislikes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abrupt Transitions: The shift from the survey results to the nanoparticle investigation is somewhat abrupt. A smoother transition or a connecting statement would improve the flow of the abstract. • Limited Context: The abstract could benefit from more context about the significance of bacterial leaf blight in rice production and the relevance of nanoparticle research to broader agricultural practices. • Lack of Detail on Methodology: The abstract briefly mentions the use of nanoparticles but doesn't provide details on the methodology, which could be important for understanding how the antimicrobial activity was assessed. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>"Prevalence of Bacterial Leaf Blight in Rice Across Andhra Pradesh and In Vitro Assessment of Silver and Copper Nanoparticles Against <i>Xanthomonas oryzae</i> pv. <i>oryzae</i>" OR "Investigating Bacterial Leaf Blight in Rice in Andhra Pradesh and the In Vitro Assessment of Silver and Copper Nanoparticles Against <i>Xanthomonas oryzae</i> pv. <i>oryzae</i>"</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>1. Objective Statement:</p> <p>Include a brief statement of the study's overall objective or research question at the beginning of the abstract. This would set the context for the findings.</p> <p>Example: "This study aimed to assess the prevalence of bacterial leaf blight in rice across Andhra Pradesh and evaluate the antimicrobial efficacy of silver and copper nanoparticles against <i>Xanthomonas oryzae</i> pv. <i>oryzae</i>."</p> <p>The abstract clearly outlines the survey's objectives, methodology, and findings, making it easy to understand the scope and significance of the research. The use of specific percentages and disease indices provides concrete data that strengthens the abstract and makes the findings more compelling. Mentioning specific locations (e.g., Chinta Reddy Palem village in Nellore district) gives the study regional relevance and contextualizes the data.</p> <p>2. Methodology Brief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a concise description of the methodology used for both the survey and the nanoparticle evaluation. This helps readers understand how the data was collected and the results obtained. • Example: "A roving survey was conducted across major rice-growing districts during Kharif 2023, and the antimicrobial activity of nanoparticles was tested using standard in vitro assays." <p>3. Significance of Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefly mention the significance of the findings, both in terms of the disease's impact on rice production and the potential use of nanoparticles as a management strategy. • Example: "These findings highlight the need for targeted disease management in susceptible regions and suggest that silver nanoparticles may offer a promising alternative to traditional control methods." <p>4. Future Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If space permits, include a sentence on potential future research or practical applications based on the study's findings. • Example: "Further research is needed to explore the field application of nanoparticles and their long-term effects on rice crops." <p>Suggestions for Deletion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redundancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The phrase "Another investigation on the effect of nanoparticles on Xoo" can be streamlined or integrated into the rest of the sentence to avoid repetition. • Example: "The study also investigated the antimicrobial effects of copper and silver nanoparticles against Xoo." 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, its well a convincing draft</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound because it combines field surveys with laboratory-based experiments, providing a comprehensive approach to studying bacterial leaf blight of rice. The field survey, conducted across major rice-growing districts, ensures that the findings on disease prevalence are representative and relevant to the region. Additionally, the in vitro evaluation of silver and copper nanoparticles against <i>Xanthomonas oryzae</i> pv. <i>oryzae</i> is a well-established method for assessing antimicrobial activity, adding a layer of experimental rigor to the study. The use of quantitative data, such as percent disease index and nanoparticle concentration, further strengthens the scientific validity of the findings. Overall, the manuscript integrates practical field data with controlled laboratory research, making it a credible and valuable contribution to the field of plant pathology.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References quoted in manuscript need minor corrections which are mentioned on manuscript</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear Presentation: The article clearly presents the study's findings and provides specific data, which is valuable in scholarly writing. • Use of Technical Terms: Appropriate technical terminology is used, which is expected in academic writing, particularly in specialized fields like plant pathology. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitions: Some transitions between ideas are abrupt, such as the shift from the survey results to the nanoparticle evaluation. Smoother transitions would improve the flow of the abstract. • Conciseness: The abstract could be more concise in some areas. For example, the phrase "Another investigation on the effect of nanoparticles on Xoo" could be rephrased for brevity and clarity. • Sentence Structure: Some sentences are long and could be broken down into shorter, more manageable segments for better readability. <p>Overall, the language is appropriate for scholarly communications, but minor revisions could enhance its effectiveness.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</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>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>Rashid Mumtaz Khan</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Qassim University, Saudi Arabia</p>