

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_CJAST_129934 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Inventory of parasitic nematodes associated with cotton in Burkina Faso |
| 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>

PART 1: 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> |
|--|--|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">It serves as baseline information of nematode parasite of cotton for nematologistIt shows the abundance of PPNs on cotton producing area of the country and future impact nematodes on cotton was estimatedIt shows the direction to implement certain management practices | Ok. See in original manuscript |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Survey of plant parasitic parasitic nematodes associated with cotton in Burkina Faso | Ok |
| 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. | In the abstract part, recommendation is missed. It is better to incorporate future line of works based on the previous finding | Ok; see original manuscript |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | It is sufficient | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes | |
| Optional/General comments | In the manuscript nematode genera identification method is not mentioned in the methodology part. How do the authors identify the nematode genera? He/she must be used the nematode identification key developed by scholars, this should be cited and incorporated in the methodology part. Map in the manuscript indicates the cotton producing area in the country rather than do not show nematode sampling points. It is better to indicate the study area where the samples were collected on the map | Ok for these observations. |

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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