

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103791
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of sweet potato genotypes against sweet potato weevil (Cylas formicarius)
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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<b>The paper include good data, and the manuscript Includes all the necessary information about the paper</b>  <b>Very Relevant</b>  The abstract sufficient and informative  <b>Yes, acceptable &amp; appropriate</b>  <b>Adequate</b>  <b>Sufficient, and in a proper format according to author Instruction</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I have the following comment, the paper have good data and deals with important issue.	

### 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)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Magdy Youssef Mahmoud El-Kholy</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Research Centre, Egypt</b>