

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_102318</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Selection of Powdery Mildew Resistant Brassica Genotypes based on Disease Indexing and Microsatellite Markers</b>
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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>The paper may be useful for mustard breeding.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>Yes</b></p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>Yes</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>Yes</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>The references sufficient and recent</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>		
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	English may be improved.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Section Data analysis states that tree was constructed by UPGMA method using Nei's genetic distance. However, according the legend to Fig. 2 indicates that the tree was built by Neighbour Joining method.</p> <p>The parameters used to construct the tree and the values of branch support are not given.</p> <p>According the Fig.2 and contrary to the text in the Results and Discussion genotypes Rohini, WRR-22, PC-6, Pusa Bold, China, WRR-8, GSL-1, WRR-7, RH-749, L-4 and RB-50 do not form a separate group.</p> <p>Severity scoring method shown in Table 4 not specified.</p> <p>SSR marker sequence data source not specified in Materials and Methods.</p> <p>The file with my other corrections of the manuscript is attached</p>	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aleksey Troitsky</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia</b>