

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_120286
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOCHEMICAL STUDIES CONTRIBUTING FOR RESISTANCE IN MUNGBEAN GENOTYPES AGAINST MUNGBEAN YELLOW MOSAIC VIRUS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript on biochemical studies contributing to resistance in mungbean genotypes against Mungbean Yellow Mosaic Virus is highly valuable for the scientific community. It provides crucial insights into the biochemical mechanisms underlying resistance to a prevalent viral disease in mungbean, offering a foundation for further research in plant pathology and breeding for disease-resistant varieties.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, "Biochemical Studies Contributing for Resistance in Mungbean Genotypes Against Mungbean Yellow Mosaic Virus," effectively conveys the focus and purpose of the research. However, a more concise and impactful title could be "Enhancing Mungbean Resistance to Yellow Mosaic Virus: Insights from Biochemical Studies."</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article provides a concise overview of the study, highlighting the importance of mungbean as a pulse crop and the significance of understanding biochemical mechanisms for resistance against Mungbean Yellow Mosaic Virus. However, to enhance comprehensiveness, the abstract could benefit from the inclusion of specific findings or key results from the study. Additionally, mentioning the methodology employed or the number of genotypes tested could provide a clearer picture of the research scope. Therefore, I recommend adding a brief summary of the main results or findings obtained from the biochemical analyses conducted on the mungbean genotypes to strengthen the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to have a well-structured format with clear subsections that guide the reader through the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript's incorporation of established methodologies, clear categorization of genotypes, and detailed biochemical analyses contribute to its scientific credibility.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =</p>	<p>It should be adjusted. To enhance the manuscript's credibility and relevance, it would be beneficial to include more recent references that focus on similar biochemical studies in mungbean genotypes or the interaction between plants and viral infections. For instance, incorporating recent publications on plant-virus interactions, biochemical responses to viral infections, or advancements in mungbean genomics could strengthen the manuscript's scientific foundation.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The text is clear, coherent, and effectively conveys the research objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. There are no apparent issues with grammar, syntax, or readability that would hinder the understanding of the scientific content presented in the manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zemedkun Alemu
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia