

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_99437
Title of the Manuscript:	Rapid method for genomic DNA isolation of mungbean [Vigna radiata (L.) Wilczek]
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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
Compulsory 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)	<p>Yes, the manuscript is very important for scientific community because the advent of DNA markers resulted in an inevitable revolution in plant genetics and breeding so, Rapid method for genomic DNA isolation of mungbean is very good idea.</p> <p>Yes, the title of this article is suitable</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of this article comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent but I prefer to support it by recent references until, 2023 year.</p> <p>Thank you these comments are enough.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>Yes, language/English quality of the article is very good and suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The article idea is very good but some words need to repair it. So, it were repaired it and rewrite by red line.</p> <p>It was reviewed the references list but it found one author did not find it interior the manuscript so, must inter it or clear from list.</p> <p>Handayani F., Wulandari R. A., Murti R. H. (2016). Genomic DNA extraction method from mature leaf of lai (<i>Durio kutejensis</i> Becc.). Agrivita. 38(1): 73-79.</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)
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:	Mohamed Fathy Zaki Soliman
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt