

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARRB_84202</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>BUILDING PROCESS OF POTATO VIRUS Y MANAGEMENT ON TOBACCO PLANTS IN THE NORTHERN VIETNAM</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy> )

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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. The author concluded the strategies in controlling PVY infection in tobacco, I suggest the authors to introduce more about PVY, at least the genome structure, a simple introduction of the replication process of PVY, as well as its transmission.</p> <p>2. In the introduction section, “For viruses of Tospovirus.....”, I have no idea if this is necessary here, and if the author believe this section is necessary, please explain clearly the relationship between this section and the above section, since you have presented four pieces of measurements.</p> <p>3. In the third section, the authors stated that “There are three main strategies for managing PVY.....”, however, I saw more than 10 strategies were listed. I am wondering what are the three main strategies.</p> <p>4. Some of the sentences are hard to understand, for example “The study consisted of 3 technical groups such as growing season; Sanitization and destruction of diseased plants, diseased host plants before a new season and after harvesting”, I suggest the author to revise them and make it easy to understand.</p> <p>5. The language are badly organised and there are many grammatical errors through the manuscript, I suggest the author turn to a native speaker for help to polish the language.</p>	<p>1. The author havs added information about virus PVY in introduction.</p> <p>2. The author has delleted “For viruses of Tospovirus” in 2. In the introduction section.</p> <p>3. The author has edited following reviewer</p> <p>4. The author has revised sentences for easy to understand.</p> <p>5. The author has edittef the manuscript.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. When a virus is first stated in the manuscript, the full name should be given, and if the virus is used in the following, the abbreviation should be used. For example, the TMV and CMV, as well as PVY.</p> <p>2. The second paragraph is badly organized, I suggest the author to reorganize this paragraph. For example, the author stated that PVY is transmitted by aphids in the begainning, but the number of aphids and the transmission manner showed up at he end.</p> <p>3. For the citation in the text, you have different styles, one is number, and you also have “author+year”, for example “especially is above 25°C (Bong Nam Chung et al., 2016), ”, please make sure they are in consistance.</p>	<p>1. The author has added the full name of TMV, CMV as PVY.</p> <p>2. The author has reorganized about aphids.</p> <p>3. The author has made the same reference style.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	