



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_37933
Title of the Manuscript:	Natural Incidence and Genetic Variability of Erysiphe pisi, the Causal Agent of Powdery Mildew on Peas in the Nilgiris District, Tamil Nadu, India
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	The manuscript titled “Natural Incidence and Genetic Variability of Erysiphe pisi, the Causal Agent of Powdery Mildew on Peas in the Nilgiris District, Tamil Nadu, India” provided some valuable data for E. pisi genetic diversity in Nilgiris district. However, the manuscript needs extensive editing of English language and style is required because it is very difficult to follow with so many grammar problems and mistakes. The research study is too simple and lack of detail data, the evidence presented was not fully supported the conclusion. The major concerns including: To confirm the species, ITS applicoms need to be sequenced, and controls with other Erysiphe species need to be included, only depending on 550bp bands with gRNA without any phenotypes are not enough to draw the conclusion. Typical Figures for ISSR amplification need to be included in the results. Line 198-205, this paragraph makes no sense at all. Is it for ISSR for genetic diversity analyses? As here suggested, combined other marker systems such RAPR or AFLP could be an essential supplement additional to ISSR only. In conclusion line 214-219 are overstatement, there are noe data for virulence, the results here did not show any evidence that the ISSR revealed high genetic diversity of this fungi, since there were no other comparison in this studies. There were no details for the method of survey conducts and how to collect samples. How many samples were done in each locations, any replications for samples collected in the same field, and how to pool the sample for genetic studies, These kind info are not provided. How do authors name the strains? How the phylogenetic tree conducted including the parameters for building the tree in fig3. Figure 2, makers need to be annotated, and samples 7 and 8 seems multiple bands, are they different species? Figure 1, the geographic annotation on the map also needed. The reference format was messed up, why the first reference started with [25]? Many citations were not appropriate, please cite correct references for your statement. Just a few examples, [5] in line 55, only a study on grape is not enough to conclude ISSR is the best markers... line95 with [29], it is not enough to confirm the species. The abbreviations need to be spelled out first in the text, such as “E.pisi” line29, “rDNA” line45, “IGS” line46 Line66, table1 belongs to result section Line71-73 should be included in declaration There are 12 ISSR primers in the table, but in the context it is always said “10 ISSR primers”? line 109 Over all, too many grammar, spelling, and English mistakes were in the manuscript, significant language improvement is suggested.	Phenotypic (Morphological) characters were studied. But, it was not presented here. Included Revised Removed Included All the strains were deposited in State Culture Collection and Gene Bank, Dept. of Plant Pathology, TNAU, Coimbatore - 3. P-ANU1 means P (Powdery mildew pathogen); ANU (Anumapuram) 1 (sample no. collected from anumapuram). Kindly refer already published manuscript from our centre in the following link for strain names https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308512659_Survey_of_the_Incidence_and_Severity_of_Bhendi_Abelmoschus_esculentus_L_Moench_and_Peas_Pisum_sativum_L_Powdery_Mildew_Diseases_in_Tamil_Nadu_India Erysiphe pisi is an uncultivable parasitic fungi. DNA was extracted from the environmental sample, it does contain several mycoparasites over the fungal body. Additional bands may be from Erysiphe pisi mycoparasites or it may be primer dimer, RNA contaminants. Included Revised Reference for the statement www.usa-journals.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Mwamahonje_Vol38.pdf Revised -NA- Included in declaration Revised Revised
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		