

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123196
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and Characterization of Pathogen causing Northern Corn Leaf Blight of Maize in Ri-Bhoi, Meghalaya, India.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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>Northern corn leaf blight (NCLB) is a destructive foliar disease of maize that results from infection with the fungal pathogen, <i>Exserohilum turcicum</i>. The characterization of the Pathogen in the in Ri-Bhoi, Meghalaya, India could help pathologists in the future about the variability of the fungus and how it could be controlled.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the introduction part, much is written about maize's geographical distribution which deviates from the core topic. 2. What are the climatic conditions' criteria for the pathogen to evolve? 3. Nothing is mentioned related to molecular and morphological characterization. 4. There are no previous references regarding this work. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>OK</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2.1, What are the leaf blight symptoms? 2. Please specify 10X and 40X. 3. In 2.2.1, what modification you have done in reference to the method of Turgay et al. (2020)? 4. Why 2 isolation methods of Spore germination and Hyphal tip isolation were taken. They have nearby similar procedure? Can the author underline any specific reason? 5. What are leaf spot symptoms? 	

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>The abstract could be more scientific. The results should be specific like the mentioning the cultural and morphological parameters .</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Though 2 isolation methods are mentioned, in Results section only 1 method (Hyphal tip) is elaborated. 2. The temp is 26 ± 2 °C, but previously 25 ± 1 °C is given. 3. How many fungal isolates are taken for study as you have collected from three areas {CPGS-AS (Umiam), College of Agriculture (Kyrdekulai) and ICAR-RC for NEH region (Umiam)}. The isolates are only mentioned in the phylogenetic tree diagram. It has not been discussed anywhere else. 4. Has the author found any genetic similarity or variation from the pathogen collected from the three areas? 5. The Fig 7. Has the picture of probably 1 isolate .Can you inform,it is of which region? 6. No information is mentioned from Fig 8 in the Results section. 7. Universal ITS oligonucleotide primer (ITS 1F and ITS 4R) were employed for only distinguishing the pathogen from NCBI. I think, no molecular characterization studies were done. Previous studies had reported about SSR markers. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</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>I think minor revisions are needed with more robust details. Some data are missing like nothing is written in results section of spore germination method. Molecular characterisation is missing ;only 1 marker is used to validate.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Ok</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Ok.It could be more well written.</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prachitara Rout
Department, University & Country	National Rice Research Institute, India