

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_80675
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDIES ON TRANSMISSION OF PHYTOPLASMA IN SESAME
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### **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://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The abstract is not adequate as the methods used in the experiment were not highlighted.</li> <li>ii. There are no references in the materials and Methods section. Are the method used never been use before or they being used as in the study for the first time.</li> <li>iii. Where was the experiment carried out? Please state if it was carried out in 'S.V. Agricultural College, Tirupati' and write the full name or meaning of S.V., in the Materials and Methods section. And where is Tirupati. Is it in America or where.</li> <li>iv. State clearly where the experiment was carried out, was it in the North or in the South of India in the materials and Methods section.</li> <li>v. And give brief background of the prevalence of the different species of insect in the two regions.</li> <li>vi. Once scientific names are mention for the first time, the next time they are used their genus names are abbreviated. E.g <i>Orosius albicinctus</i> and <i>Hishimonus phycitis</i> as <i>O. albicinctus</i> and <i>H. phycitis</i></li> <li>vii. The authors used the term 'Days of Acquisition Feeding' and gave the abbreviation as (DAF). This implies that the abbreviation can be used in place of the full terms. Are you repeating it to increase the manuscript page or what? You only write it in full again when starting a sentence with it or in a title.</li> <li>viii. Please re-phrase this sentence or delete it completely because it contradiction the findings in the work '<b>The presence of phytoplasma in <i>H. phycitis</i> was confirmed by nested PCR assays and concluded that <i>H. phycitis</i> can be considered as a new vector of phyllody from North East region of India in addition with <i>Orosius albicinctus</i></b>'</li> <li>ix. 'The abiotic factors prevailing during the period of experimentation with <i>Hishimonus</i> at Tirupati may be different from the experimental conditions prevailed by the work of Nabi <i>et al.</i> (2015) at IARI, New Delhi , which might have contributed to non-appearance of phyllody symptoms when <i>Hishimonus</i> was used as vector for disease transmission in the present investigations'. The authors are speculative without facts. They can as well delete if they can provide references.</li> <li>x. <b>If it</b> has also been demonstrated that the latent period <i>i.e.</i> the period between acquisition of phytoplasma (AAP) and the ability of the insect vector to transmit the phytoplasma into a healthy plant ranges from 7 to 80 days, why did you (authors) choose to work with a maximum of 7 days of acquisition period on phyllody infected plant, which could be one of the reasons for absence of appearance of any phyllody symptoms when <i>Hishimonus</i> was used as vector in the studies.</li> <li>xi. <b>The authors seem to include arguments that tend to contradict their findings. Please go through the entire write-up again and remove arguments that tend to discredit the credibility of the work</b></li> <li>xii. <b>When you have two papers from the same author in the same year, the one that comes first is given as 'Akhtar et al. 2009a' and not '...2009b' used before the formal.</b></li> </ul> <p>See other comments in the General comment section</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Minor revision needed	

## Review Form 1.6

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. The number of references cited is adequate but not well distributed to the various sections in the manuscript. Authors cited a total of 28 references; 4 in the Introduction, 0 in the Materials and Methods section and 24 in the results and discussion section. They cited too few in the introduction and known at all in the Materials and Methods section. The work is not a new study that has not been done in the past, so references must be cited</li><li>ii. The authors' discussions shows that they didn't fully carry out a comprehensive study of the subject area. See corrections 'xi' in the reviewer comment above. With Minor Revision the paper can be processed as a short research article. However with Major Revision it can be accepted as a full research article.</li><li>iii. The authors should effect all the corrections as instructed and resubmit for acceptance</li></ul>	
----------------------------------	--	--

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ogbebor O. Nicholas</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rubber Research Institute of Nigeria, Nigeria</b>