

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_JABB_117632</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Identification of resistance gene through RGA markers in resistant mungbean genotypes</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>The article's title is not in accordance with its content.</p> <p>The article's abstract and interpretation of the data must be improved.</p> <p>The manuscript's sections and structure can be better</p> <p>The manuscript lacks of scientifically accurate interpretation and confirmation of obtained data.</p> <p>It is possible to expand the references</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>English quality it's OK</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents evidence of marked differences in the tolerance of different genotypes to the virus. However, it does not provide any method of confirming the presence of the virus in the evaluated plants. Some materials show lower incidence and severity of the disease, but they cannot be considered resistant.</p> <p>It is crucial to have a reliable method for confirming the presence of the virus in plants to accurately assess their tolerance levels. Without this confirmation, the results presented in the manuscript may not be conclusive or reliable.</p> <p>While it is promising to see some materials exhibiting lower incidence and severity of the disease, it is important to note that this does not necessarily mean they are resistant to the virus. Further research and testing are needed to determine the true level of resistance in these materials.</p> <p>In conclusion, while the manuscript provides valuable insights into the tolerance of different genotypes to the virus, the lack of a confirmation method for the virus in the evaluated plants is a significant limitation. Future studies should focus on developing reliable methods for virus confirmation to ensure the accuracy and reliability of research findings in this area.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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>Arnaldo Esquivel-Fariña</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional de Asunción, Paraguay</b>