



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_42964
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular detection of Ugandan passiflora virus infecting passionfruit (<i>Passiflora edulis sims</i>) in Rwanda
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:
(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ABSTRACT-line 5, it is unreasonable to use words 'diseased and healthy passionfruit plants' before virus diagnosis was performed. Might deleted words 'diseased and healthy' 2. ABSTRACT(a) line 11, 'Partial sequences of coat protein gene' must change to 'partial amino acid sequence of coat protein of xxx(number) residues were used to determine the identity..... Please specify the amount (number) of amino acid residue used in the comparison. (b) Therefore in Results: If possible, please give the genbank accession number of each CP gene nucleotide sequence in this study. (After submit sequence, it may take about a week to get acc. no. for manuscript preparing.) 3. Material & Methods: (a) 2.5 Primers used..... The authors developed two sets of primers to detect UPV which provide 772 and 200 nts of PCR products. Please give more explanation how the primers were designed and what position in CP gene would be obtained. Why used these two sets & what advantages? (b) Table 2- 'Partial coat protein nucleotide sequence of known strains obtained from the genbank', should be rewritten because the list contained complete cds for CP gene (not partial CP gene). May change to; Table 2. Known potyvirus strain sequences obtained from the genbank which were used for sequence comparison. 4. Results and Discussion: (a) Line 112; Collected leaf samples were tested for the presence of viruses using three sets of polyclonal antibodies. The authors used antibody for generic potyviruses-not three viruses, and used three antibodies; i.e Generic potyvirus, CMV and CABMV. (b) Line 125-Table 3. Last column (Unidentified potyvirus- this is incorrect) should be deleted, because the authors did not know which potyvirus or how many potyvirus was unidentified.Even in samples showing positive RT-PCR with UPV primers, there might contained other potyviruses as mixed infection. The authos may explaine the results when used each set of UPV primers, that the result get along well or how different? Between using each set of UPV primers. (c) Line 128-3.1.3 Sequence analysis. The authors used the deduced amino acid sequence of partial CP gene of Rwandan isolate for amino acid sequence comparison, they should define how long and numbers of amino acid residues used in their identity analysis (result shown in Table 4), and must state the criteria for potyvirus strain demarcation with reference cited (e.g. Adams et al., 2005, Fauquet et al., 2005, or update ones.) (d) Fig.2. Line 155- The tree is not rooted on SPGPVY potato virus Y, The SPGPVY1 is used as the outgroup taxa. (e) Line 168-169 May delete the sentence 'Thus, they are probably sharing a common evolutionary ancestor' since there was no evidence for evolution analysis in this study. (f) Line 190-...that RT-PCR was 2 times more sensitive in detection of potyvirus than ELISA method. This is misinterpreted. More sensitivity means the RT-PCR method could detect even very small amount of virus in the sample, not the number of positive samples, (does not matter it is twice or more times). In this case more (not really twice, but higher percentage) positive samples were detected when using RT-PCR compared to ELISA. Please rewrite. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title: Please consider the following title: Serological and Molecular Detection of (add the first word 'Serological') 2. References: Line 222. Please correct the format. [move '(1994)'] 	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Optional/General comments	NONE	
----------------------------------	------	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Pissawan Chiemsombat</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Kasetsart University, Thailand</i>