

Fife,Austin N

From: Bolton, Sam <Samuel.Bolton@fdacs.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 10:24 AM
To: Stelinski,Kirsten; Martini,Xavier; Fife,Austin N; Paret,Mathews; Griesheimer, Jessica
Subject: RE: [FLAENT] Editor Decision

[External Email]

What exactly does Reviewer C want labelled for the dorsal view? I don't have the file. The figure of the prodorsum is self-explanatory and obviously diagnostic for the species. It would be unconventional to label the prodorsal striae and setae. A ventral view is clearly unnecessary because this is not a re-description. The venter holds no real diagnostic value.

Sam

From: Dr. Kirsten Pelz-Stelinski via Florida Online Journals <noreply@journals.flvc.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 10:05 AM
To: Xavier Martini <xmartini@ufl.edu>; Austin Fife <afife@ufl.edu>; Bolton, Sam <Samuel.Bolton@fdacs.gov>; Mathews Paret <paret@ufl.edu>; Jessica Leigh Griesheimer <jgriesheimer@ufl.edu>
Subject: [FLAENT] Editor Decision

Xavier Martini, Austin Fife, Samuel Bolton, Mathews Paret, Jessica Leigh Griesheimer:

Thank you for submitting your paper, "First report of Phyllocoptes fructiphilus Keifer, the vector of the Rose Rosette Virus, in Florida," to the Journal for consideration. Expert referees have now reviewed it, and there are a number of minor points (see enclosed comments) that need some attention before the Editors are able to recommend acceptance of your paper. We ask you to submit your revision using our online system.

When resubmitting your paper you must provide a point by point list of your response to the reviewers' and Editor's comments on your paper including where you have made changes to your manuscript.

Before you resubmit your paper, please carefully proof-read the manuscript to minimize typographical, grammatical, bibliographical errors and make sure it is properly formatted according to the author instructions. In addition to submitting a final version please submit a copy that highlights any changes to the text in red.

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Kind regards,
Dr. Kirsten Pelz-Stelinski
University of Florida
pelzstelinski@ufl.edu

Reviewer A:

A well written note about the work to determine id this mite is in Florida. I have put a few comments for consideration.

I would also encourage the authors to use the spanish translation for the disease/virus that has already been published by the NCPN in their fact sheet on RRD instead of their translated name.

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Reviewer B:

Very important report, I did not notice if the article included photos of the rose plants, but it could be helpful to have a photo to help the reader to understand under the circumstances were the mites were present. I did not see a list of identification of the species or varieties of the roses that were sample, hope the authors consider to mention or list them as well. Minor comments, please see the file attached.

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Reviewer C:

The manuscript by Fife et al. provides a clear description of the first finding and subsequent survey for *Phyllocoptes fructiphilus*, the only known vector of rose rosette virus. A number of comments and suggestions for clarifying the text are included in the attached 'Track Changes' version of the submitted file. Correction of the orthography for the virus name (both taxonomic and common name), and labeling of the dorsal and ventral views of the mite are the most important points.

This manuscript is certainly worthy of publication of a suitably revised version.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer D:

The MS is well written and made an important discovery related to RRD which is a serious issue in other parts of the US. FL has one the largest rose industry and this findings is very critical so that the growers are aware. This MS should be published.

Few comments to consider:

Line 32: Change to U.S. to be consistent.

Line 35: Were the plants with symptom found from nursery or landscape? If nursery.

Line 38: “acting as a vector for the disease”. Were the RRD present in the landscape or nursery? If not present, how can you survey mites on the RRD plants?

Line 39: Please say where Leon Co. is located?

Lines 63-66: “These roses were tested for RRV with RT-qPCR and Reverse Transcription Recombinase Polymerase Amplification (RT-RPA) (Babu et al. 2016, 2017). However, none of the plants infested with *P. fructiphilus* were positive for RRV.” Were the RT-qPCR and RT-RPA techniques capable of detecting RRV on asymptomatic plant tissue? If yes. This is important and please keep this sentence. Also, concisely indicate the primers and essential procedures pertaining to this technique used here. If not, please delete. This is not adding anything instead will confuse readers.

Lines 73-74: Same comment as indicated before.

Lines 75-76: “...RRV is currently not established in Florida” The review think that this is bold statement. It may be true for the region of FL where the sampling was conducted. How can the authors say that RRV is not present in entire FL? Have you tested roses from different parts of the state? It is possible that the plant may not show symptoms but still carry the virus. Please clarify.

Lines 73 and 93: Please be careful when you say “no virus was found”. Maybe, add a phrase “based the detection tool developed to date.” Or something similar.

Fig. 1C: Axis lines are not visible.

Recommendation: Revisions Required
