

Review Form 1.7

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

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
--	---------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Review Form 1.7

<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, especially for researchers in plant pathology, genetics, and crop improvement. It addresses a significant issue related to Mungbean Yellow Mosaic Virus (MYMV) resistance, which has direct implications for improving mungbean yields and ensuring food security. Identifying resistant genotypes and validating molecular markers are crucial steps toward developing resistant crop varieties. 2. The title of the article is suitable and does not require modification. 3. The abstract is comprehensive but needs improvement in clarity and structure should briefly mention the problem, methodology, key results, and implications. For example, highlighting the specific resistant genotypes and the significance of the findings could enhance its impact. 4. The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate for a scientific paper. The introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion sections are well-organized. 5. The references are adequate but could be updated with more recent studies to reflect the latest advancements in the field. Including recent publications on MYMV resistance and molecular marker development would strengthen the manuscript's relevance. Here are some suggested references: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recent reviews on MYMV resistance in legumes. - Studies on the application of RGA markers in plant breeding. - Latest advances in molecular techniques for virus resistance. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article require minor revisions to meet the standards of scholarly communication. While the manuscript effectively conveys the research, there are several areas where clarity, grammar, and style can be improved. Here are some specific suggestions:</p> <p>Grammar and Syntax: Ensure that all sentences are grammatically correct, with proper subject-verb agreement and consistent use of tense.</p> <p>Example Revision: Change "Fungal pathogens employ a distinct tactics" to "Fungal pathogens employ distinct tactics."</p> <p>Clarity and Conciseness: Some sentences are overly complex or vague and can be simplified for better understanding.</p> <p>Example Revision: Simplify "The identification of resistant genotypes and validation of molecular markers..." to "Identifying resistant genotypes and validating molecular markers..."</p> <p>Scientific Terminology: Use consistent and precise scientific terminology throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Example Revision: Ensure consistent use of terms like "septins," "RGA markers," and "MYMV resistance."</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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:	Guoqing Cai
Department, University & Country	Trine University, USA