

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_116111
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of the resistant sources for sunflower downy mildew in sunflower
Type of the Article	Short communication

Review Form 1.7

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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is of great value to the scientific community. It reports in detail on identification studies on sources of resistance to sunflower downy mildew, including results from field evaluation trials and validation tests. The study not only provides specific data on resistance to downy mildew in specific sunflower varieties, but also points out possible genotypes for resistance, providing a valuable resource for future breeding efforts. In addition, the manuscript reveals the possible presence of pathogenic bacteria in the experimental soil, providing new clues for the scientific community to understand and control sunflower downy mildew. Therefore, this manuscript is important for the promotion of healthy sunflower cultivation and plant pathology research.</p> <p>The title of the article, "Identification of sources of resistance to sunflower downy mildew", is appropriate. It accurately summarises the main content of the article, i.e. identification of genotypes with resistance to sunflower downy mildew, which helps the reader to quickly understand the focus of the article.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is quite comprehensive. It covers the time frame, location, methods, results, and conclusions of the study. The abstract clearly outlines the purpose, process, and findings of the four assessment trials and one validation trial, specifically pointing out the genotypes with disease resistance and how they performed in the manual screen. In addition, the abstract mentions the effect of possible pathogens present in the experimental soils on specific varieties and the potential application of disease-resistant genotypes in future breeding endeavours.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The article is organised according to the conventional structure of introduction, methods, results and discussion, making the content well organised and easy to read and understand. Each section is centred on a specific topic, is logically coherent and presents information in an orderly manner.</p> <p>Based on the content provided, I believe the manuscript is scientifically sound. The study design is sound, the experimental procedure is detailed, the data analysis is objective, and the conclusions are reliable. The performance of the disease resistance genotypes in the validation trial mentioned in the article also supports the reliability of the findings. In addition, the article mentions the possible presence of pathogenic bacteria in the experimental soil, which adds to the depth and breadth of the study and further proves its scientific validity.</p> <p>It is not possible to directly judge the adequacy and up-to-date nature of the references based on what has been provided so far. However, the references can be considered adequate if the manuscript is able to cover classical studies in the field as well as the latest research progress when citing relevant literature. To ensure that the references are complete and up-to-date, authors are advised to further check and add the latest relevant literature during the review process. If the reviewer finds additional references that need to be added, they can be noted in the review form so that the authors can revise and add them accordingly.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

<p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Minor Modifications:</p> <p>In the abstract section, a short description of the significance of the study could be added to make the abstract more complete. For example, add at the end of the abstract: "This study not only contributes to the understanding of the resistance mechanism of sunflower downy mildew, but also provides an important reference for the breeding of sunflower for disease resistance."</p> <p>When describing the experimental methods and results, some specific experimental details and data can be added appropriately to make the research process more clear and credible. For example, information on the climatic conditions, soil properties, and planting management of the experimental site can be specifically described, as well as data on the specific performance of each genotype in the experiment.</p> <p>In the discussion section, the potential application value of disease-resistant genotypes can be further analysed in depth, as well as their possible challenges and prospects in future breeding efforts. This helps to enhance the theoretical depth and practicality of the article.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Regarding the language/English quality of the article:</p> <p>From the content provided, the English quality of the article is generally suitable for academic communication. The language is clear and precise, terminology is used appropriately, and grammar and spelling are generally correct. However, in order to further improve the accuracy and fluency of English expression, the authors are advised to pay attention to the following points:</p> <p>Double-check the accurate use of terminology to ensure consistency with common international expressions.</p> <p>Pay attention to the variety and complexity of sentence structures and avoid excessive use of simple sentences to enhance the richness of expression.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Liu-Qijia</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Shinhan University, South Korea</p>