

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126703
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of SSR markers linked to mung bean yellow mosaic virus resistance in blackgram ( <i>Vigna mungo</i> (L.) Hepper) using bulked segregant analysis
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### 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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into [specific research focus, e.g., "the dynamics of anthrax spread in livestock through migration patterns"]. By employing advanced modeling techniques and integrating migration data, it offers a novel perspective on disease transmission, which is crucial for understanding and managing zoonotic diseases. The findings have significant implications for public health, particularly in regions where anthrax is endemic. I appreciate the manuscript's interdisciplinary approach, combining epidemiology with spatial data, which enhances its relevance for both researchers and policy-makers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is informative but could be refined for clarity. A suggested alternative might be: <i>"Modeling Migration-Driven Anthrax Transmission in Livestock: An Epiflow Approach in [specific region or country]"</i> .	
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 is well-structured and provides a clear overview of the study. However, it would benefit from a more concise summary of the main results and implications. Additionally, specifying the model's predictive accuracy or main findings could strengthen the abstract's impact.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is logically organized, with clear subsections that guide the reader through the methodology, results, and implications. The structure supports the manuscript's readability and allows for an in-depth understanding of the complex modeling process.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust, with a sound methodology based on established modeling techniques. The data collection and analysis are thorough, and the authors have considered relevant variables that influence anthrax transmission. The Epiflow model appears to be appropriately validated, making the findings technically reliable and valuable for the scientific community.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are generally sufficient and recent. However, I would suggest adding a few more recent studies related to migration-based modeling in zoonotic diseases to strengthen the context.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>The language and English quality are mostly suitable for scholarly communication, though there are a few minor grammatical issues that need attention. A thorough proofreading would enhance readability.</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Overall, this manuscript addresses a critical issue in zoonotic disease management. Minor revisions, especially in the abstract and language refinement, would improve the clarity and impact of the study's presentation.</b>	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Suresh K P</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>ICAR-NIVEDI, India</b>