



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_45663
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of Nucleocapsid protein gene of Groundnut bud necrosis virus (GBNV) in Tamil Nadu and its phylogeny relationship
Type of the 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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	quasi-spherical in shape and 80-110 nm in dia with tripartite single-stranded RNA virus. The	
Optional/General comments	There are errors at many place with regard to the writing of the value and its unit example (50 ml were at certain point you have not put any space between the value and its unit 50ml) so i advise author to fallow uniform pattern throughout the manuscript that will be more effective. Besides this there is also mistakes in witing in reference (Bhat AI, Jain RK, Varma A, Lal, SK. 2002 . Nucleocapsid protein gene sequence studies suggest that soybean bud blight is caused by a strain of <i>Groundnut bud necrosis virus</i> . Current Science. 2002;82:1389-1392) Fallow the one style of writing of the references.	

Comment [m1]: Diameter or is it some thing elase

Comment [m2]: You mention the date towice in this reference so correct it.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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:	Muzafar Akbar Rather
Department, University & Country	Barkatullah University, India