

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126365
Title of the Manuscript:	Harnessing DUS Traits for the Identification and Protection of Lentil (<i>Lens Culinaris</i> L.) Genotypes in Breeding Programme
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 (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.	DUS (Distinctness, Uniformity, and Stability) characterization is essential in agriculture for identifying, cataloging, and protecting plant varieties. It provides a standardized approach to assess new crop varieties for unique traits, consistent expression, and stability over generations. This characterization helps in variety registration, ensuring breeders' rights, and protecting intellectual property. By promoting genetic diversity, DUS characterization encourages the development of improved crop varieties that are resilient, high-yielding, and adaptable to diverse climates. It also supports farmers in selecting reliable, high-quality seeds, thereby enhancing agricultural productivity, food security, and sustainability in an increasingly variable climate.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not suitable DUS characterization in lentil (<i>Lens culinaris</i> Medik) using morphological descriptors or markers	
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 section can be improved based on the importance of the problem and results of the study	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. All sections must be improved significantly	
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 involved DUS characterization based on guidelines from the PPVFRA for lentil varieties. It meticulously examines morphological traits that facilitate accurate differentiation between varieties, essential for reliable registration and protection of plant breeders' rights. Furthermore, the study contributes valuable insights into the genetic diversity of lentils, supporting the advancement of sustainable agricultural practices and the development of improved varieties for enhanced productivity and resilience.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some latest references may be added (10-15)	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	The language and coherence can be improved for publication quality standard.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check scientific name and follow it throughout the manuscript 2. Introduction section can be enhanced with importance of the study/problem and role of PPVFRA/descriptors, including references 3. Why authors have highlighted molecular markers when they have not used it in the introduction section 4. Some references are too old. Remove if not too important 5. Mention information about thirteen traits observed in the M&M section along with classes 6. All the figures from 1-8 can be combined into a single figure including the mention of trait and its classes in the figure itself. 7. Similarly, combine all pie charts into a single figure 8. How did the authors confirm presence of genetic variability! Did they used any statistical analysis for this? 9. The experiments can be explained in more detail in the M&M section for more clarity 10. Overall the manuscript (particularly results and discussion section) is too short for to be considered as research article. 11. This study has little strength and is not able to contribute significant information. The manuscript can be considered as short communication/research note after revisions if authors agrees. 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amit Rana
Department, University & Country	CSIR-Institute of Himalayan Bioresource Technology, India