

### Review Form 3

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>                                 |
| 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>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| 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.                        | Okra is a significant vegetable crop consumed throughout India, and YVMV is the most destructive disease that causes severe losses. Thus, it is necessary to gather in-depth knowledge about host-pathogen interactions in order to develop management strategies and breeding programmes.   |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable?<br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)   | Yes  |   |
| 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.   | The abstract of the manuscript is not suitable. It should be framed in a manner to contain an introduction, aim, materials, methods, results, and conclusion from the overall manuscript in about 250 words. Additionally, the language is very weak and scientific disparity. The authors should usually avoid using any abbreviations in the abstract.   |   |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  | The subsections and structure are appropriate but lack general consensus. The paragraphs are not in the flow of literature. The subsection 2.5 PCR amplification using reference and target primers of materials and methods is not described in the results and discussion. The figure of this subsection is also absent.   |   |
| 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. | The manuscript contains many scientific incorrectness. It is lacklustre on the front of describing the idea behind performing the investigation and the studies which are already conducted on okra and YVMV. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The description of using the Tubulin gene as a reference gene is not provided.</li> <li>• There is no pictorial proof of Whiteflies feeding on both the species of okra.</li> <li>• In Figure 3 depicting the q-PCR results, the length of bars is incorrect with the standard error presented.</li> <li>• In Figure 3 depicting the q-PCR results, the DNMR analysis is not provided which states the significance between the treatments.</li> <li>• In Figure 3 depicting the q-PCR results if 0 DPI represents the initial time point of control, then how can the results show gene expression of virus coat protein in q-PCR is incorrect.</li> </ul> |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   | The references are sufficient but are not recent.  |   |
| Minor REVISION comments   | The quality of English needs improvement with either the American style or the British style of writing.   |   |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?   |  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  |  |   |

#### PART 2:

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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? | <u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u> |  |

#### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Md. Mahtab Rashid</b>                    |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Bihar Agricultural University, India</b> |