

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_131109
Title of the Manuscript:	Survey and identification of plant parasitic nematodes associated with tea gardens in Dibrugarh district of Assam
Type of the Article	

#### General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.**

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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	-It is a good article that highlights the threat of Plant parasitic nematodes (PPNs) on Tea which is an economically important cash crop globally -T he article contributes to scientific community by highlighting the major PPNs that may limit tea production -However, the author needs to elaborate and refine on the methodology section and presentation of results	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	-The title is okay	
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.	-The abstract is done well. However, the author needs to clarify which of the genera is Tylechs -The author should summarize the last part of the abstract, may be to read: <i>Helicotylenchus</i> ranked first in ..... ,....., ..... followed by <i>Hoploilaimus</i> and <i>Pratylenchus</i> in descending order, to avoid repetition -The author needs to give a statement of the implications of the findings to tea production sector. Of what importance are these results the concerned stakeholders?	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is correct. However: the current form must be revised to make it scientifically better. -In introduction: Kindly give the latest citations to validate the current trends -In materials and methods : The author needs to simplify on how the soil samples were collected and how the nematodes were processed for each of the sample Since this was a survey, it is expected that farming practices, edaphic, and other environmental factors in each of the gardens should have been established using a questionnaire. This is particularly, important because they may have an influence on occurrence and survival of nematodes -Was the tea grown in all the gardens of the same variety?. You need to clarify this because varieties may behave differently when attacked by PPNs -Results and discussions: I Tend to believe that the tables should be in the main text for one to follow clearly on the presentation of results. Certain aspects of the results should be presented in bar chart format for clarity -There is no mention on how the data was analysed , how the comparisons are made in the gardens and probably how the significant means were separated. Remember this is science and you cannot use raw data to draw conclusions -The Discussion is weak minus the conditions that were prevailing in each of the gardens -Conclusion: Improve on it to capture the main objective of the study	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes but include the current references of not less than 5 year	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	-Refer to the above comments	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Waswa Stanlous Juma
Department, University & Country	Kibabii University, Bumgoma