



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_41044
Title of the Manuscript:	Induction of resistance in poplar to Melampsora larici-populina using L-form bacteria
Type of the Article	Short 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	The title of manuscript is appropriate. The manuscript is also suitable as a Short Research Article. The work has generally been poorly written. Possibly English is not the first language of the author thus the article should have been written by a competent hand. Many sentences are not clearly written. The author should endeavour to effect all the corrections as indicated to convey the meaning of the article. ABSTRACT : The abstract is poorly written. The author should revise the abstract according to the structure and format stipulated in the guidelines of the Journal. INTRODUCTION : Introduction is adequate but the author should include write-up on the <u>aim</u> of this study in this section. MATERIALS AND METHODS: The author of manuscript did not give details about the statistical analysis of the results obtained in this study. This is a scientific paper and as such data should be analysed statistically. If it is an omission then the author should endeavour correct this anomaly RESULTS AND DISCUSSION : Again this section of manuscript is statistically poorly presented. The statistical tool used in this work should be clearly stated. Only then could the discussion of the work be adequately explained. CONCLUSION This chapter of the manuscript could be better written pointing out the main conclusion of your work. REFERENCES The literature list should be prepared in line to Journal Editorial Requirements	Rewrote the abstract. Aim - included Done. Not much complicated data to analyse statistically. Used T test in Excel. Conclusion – rewrote. In the manuscript submitted, references were in the correct format according to the instructions given for authors.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	If all the corrections are effected the manuscript can be accepted for publication as short research article.	