



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_46625
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Rice yellow mottle virus, Sobemovirus on the N P K Ca and Mg content in infected rice leaves.
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>1.Summary: Line 1 to the end line: there supposed to be abstract subtitle and all subtitles mentioned must be eliminated with no space and there must be a little introduction of rice and rice productivity. The corrections should be done as indicated below by yellow colour :</p> <p>Abstract: Rice (<i>Oryza</i> spp) is one of the most important crops produced in the world and its productivity can reach to half of predicted local consumes because of environmental and biological factors including diseases, e.g. Rice mottle virus, but these factors can be overcome using different methods such as Mineral fertilization. The study was carried out in condition controlled with the scientific pole of Felix Houphouet-Boigny University in Biglerville from June to December 2018.The variety Bouake 189 seeds were sown in pots filled with ground soil. The 14 days old seedlings were inoculated mechanically with an isolate of RYMV. Manure of NPK 12, 24, 18 and the urea (46 % N) respectively was applied to the amount of 200 and 100 kg/ha soil. The N content, P, K, Ca, Mg and out of protein in the sheets were given. The content chlorophyll was given using Spad-505.The severity and the AUSPC of the RYMV were evaluated. The presence of the RYMV in the infected sheets was confirmed by serology Analysis. The averages of the various parameters were compared by ANOVA 2 with software STATISTICA version 7.1 .The study revealed a significant difference (p < 0.001) between the seedlings for the N content, P, K, Ca, Mg and out of proteins. The content P, K, Ca and Mg in the healthy sheets was estimated 0.40;1.10;1.49 and 0.39 % respectively, whereas those related to the infected seedlings were of 0.39;0.75;0.67 and 0.24 respectively. The N content was 2.41 % for the inoculated plants and 1.75 % for the healthy plants. The content of protein was 10.95 % for the healthy witnesses and 15.04 % for the infected plants. The content chlorophyll of the healthy seedlings was 37.37 whereas that of the inoculated seedlings was 21.23.The severity of the RYMV was reduced from 6.22 to 3.88 under the action of the mineral fertilization. While The infected sheets had a food value in rise, an increase in the amount of NPK had reduced the losses of production due to the RYMV.</p> <p>2. Experimental design: line 2 : The NPK chemical fertilizer (12 24 18) :should be corrected to :The NPK chemical fertilizer (12, 24 and 18)</p> <p>3. Materials and Method : Experimental design : Line 3 : the rate of 200kg / ha : should be corrected to : the rate of 200kg / ha soil</p> <p>4. Materials and Method : Average height of plants at tillering and flowering :</p> <p>line 1 : The height of healthy and inoculated plants was : Should be corrected to The heights of healthy and inoculated plants were</p> <p>5. Results : Effect of the studied factors: Line 1: inTable 6 show that :corrected to : inTable 6 showed that</p> <p>Line 2: the second However, : should be deleted.</p> <p>6. DISCUSSION : Line 4 :These authors also meant :should be corrected to :The authors also revealed that</p> <p>Line 11 : Authors : corrected to The Authors</p> <p>Line 15 : The results of this study confirm the conclusions of [31] ,who (the dot should be removed)</p> <p>Line 15 : This observation is consistent with the results of [32] who reported (the dot is removed)</p> <p>The third Line from the last : This level of viral load, associated with</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>nitrogen intake. would explain (the dot should be removed)</p> <p>The third Line from the last :Whatever the level of N brought , the regression(the dot should be removed)</p> <p>The second line from the last :</p> <p>Our work supports :should be corrected to : The authors contued saying : Our work supported</p> <p>7. Abbreviation : There should be definition for units and abbreviations, eg</p> <p>6. N P K Ca and Mg</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Corrections should be done</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A lot of corrections and adjustment. - The study supposed to be for two seasons (for confirmation of results) for the publication to take place but He/She is saying from June to December 2018 (the rice full season is five months) 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jackson Venusto Modi Lado
Department, University & Country	University of Juba, South Sudan