

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_127162
Title of the Manuscript:	Expression of Key Genes Related to Yellow Vein Mosaic Virus Resistance in Okra via qRT-PCR
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Expression of Key Genes Related to Yellow Vein Mosaic Virus Resistance in Okra via qRT-PCR This study presents a valuable contribution to understanding YVMV resistance in okra, particularly through the novel application of qRT-PCR to assess gene expression dynamics and providing valuable insights into the molecular response of okra to YVMV, particularly the role of 5 dpi as a critical screening time point. However, the manuscript requires significant revisions in structure, clarity, and depth of discussion before it can be considered for publication. With improvements in clarity, contextualization, and interpretation, this research could significantly contribute to plant pathology and crop improvement literature.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid redundancy in the introduction. Terms like "okra in response to YVMV disease in okra" are repetitive. • The YVMV disease in okra was first reported in India during 1924 (Kulkarni 1924). It reportedly originated in India (Shetty et al., 2013). It can be replaced as First reported in 1924 (Kulkarni, 1924), YVMV is believed to have originated in India (Shetty et al., 2013). • The host resistance is only reliable mechanism replaced by "Host resistance is the most reliable mechanism" • Provide citations consistently <p>Material methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a schematic representation of the experimental layout, including sowing, inoculation, and sampling timelines, to give a holistic view of the study. • Use consistent species naming conventions (e.g., italicizing species names and avoiding switching between common and scientific names). • More details on the rearing conditions for non-viruliferous whiteflies (e.g., temperature, humidity) would add clarity to this critical step in virus inoculation. <p>Results, discussion and conclusion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bar graphs or tables summarizing fold-change expression data across dpi for both species could make the results more accessible. • Terms such as "susceptible" and "resistant" should be consistently used when referring to the species throughout the text. • Avoid subjective phrases like "tries its best" • Include p-values or ANOVA results to confirm significant differences in fold-change expression between resistant and susceptible species at specific dpi, If possible • Revise, result and discussion for clarity • The conclusion effectively summarizes key findings but requires better clarity, scientific rigor, and a stronger link between results and broader implication 	

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>Bushra Rasoo</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>SKUAST, India</p>