



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJPSS_8567
Title of the Manuscript:	Virulence of Puccinia graminis f.sp. tritici and postulated resistance genes for stem rust in ten wheat varieties in Egypt
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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1-The Materials and Methods section is not quite clear. What I understand from it is that 1) samples were collected from wheat field and trap nursery and stored, 2) each of these samples were propagated twice on a highly susceptible wheat cultivar then, 3) wheat cultivars containing different resistance genes were tested with these different isolates of P. graminis collected in Egypt. If this is what it is, great but the section needs a little remodelling since it took me a little while to figure out the exact procedure. Along with this, Table 1 may need to be clarified as well. 1) What the Pgt-code is should be explain better, 2) subsets of wheat cultivars1 and 3 are not quite the same in the Table and in the text and, 3) I'm counting 16 isolates of P. graminis (B,C,D, etc, if these letters truly represent P. graminis isolates) instead of 15 as stated in the text following the Table.</p> <p>2-Part of the text under Table 2 should be located in section 2 of the Results. Talking about Section 2, it may need to be a little more elaborate. To me it was roughly a pure description of Table 4. For example, the section should start with a sentence explaining what has been done to get these results.</p> <p>3- Table 7 has not been referred anywhere in the text.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>4-In Section 3, I don't quite get how the authors concluded that only genes pin pointed in the text might be present in the Egyptian wheat varieties tested while presence of additional genes gave also a LIT using the same rust isolate. For example, the authors stated that cv. Giza may be protected against P. graminis by the presence of Sr genes 16 and Tmp while protection against P. graminis race 2 can also be bring by the presence of Sr genes 15, 22, 30, 26 and, 35 according to Table 5. So, what is the rules used by the authors that bring them to these conclusions.</p> <p>5-Authors should consider exploring the real presence of these known resistance genes in their cultivars by using PCR in order to add weight to their postulations. Resistance gene expression analysis might also be of interest in this study.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Many grammatical errors are done in this manuscript and here are some examples of the most important ones:</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>1-`during two growing seasons` instead of `during two seasons...growing seasons`.</p> <p>2-Sentences are way too long. Period should be added here and there.</p> <p>3-From `rust data` to `in 2008/2009` wording is very confusing.</p> <p>4-no parenthesis are necessary to state how many genes are postulated for each Egyptian cultivars.</p> <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>5-Replace `in fridge` by specific temperature, for example 4 degree Celsius.</p> <p>6-Replace `dew` by humidity which is more scientific.</p> <p>7-Replace `damp` by specific chamber conditions.</p> <p>8-Replace `very susceptible` by `highly susceptible`.</p> <p>9-Delete `adopted by` and leave only `according to`.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>10-Be consistent throughout the text. For example always refer to Eriks. & E. Henn. the same way. Consistency is also true in references list meaning that if the Journal format is Authors, Manuscript title, Abbreviation of Journal name (italicized), Year of publication and pages, then stay with that format all along the References list.</p> <p>11-Section 2. `Ten stem rust resistance genes had high efficacy` for what? Add text there.</p> <p>12-Describe LIT the first time you use it.</p> <p>13-Redundancy in the text regarding the utilization of `in addition of other genes`. Whatever resistance genes that are postulated should be state for each Egyptian cultivars</p>	
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>and only after that list, the authors should add a sentence mentioning that other unknown genes may also be present.</p> <p>Discussion 14-`four important stem rust resistance genes, namely Sr31, Sr24 and Sr26`, which is the fourth one?</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is sound but a lot still needs to be done to make it easier to follow and read in term of writing/wording and additional explanation.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Arianne Tremblay</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Biological Sciences Department, University of Maryland Baltimore County, USA</p>