

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124905
Title of the Manuscript:	Mixed infection of Cucumber mosaic virus and Capsicum chlorosis virus in pepper (<i>Capsicum annuum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Research article

Review Form 3

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community as it highlights the use of DAS-ELISA for detecting mixed viral infections in pepper germplasm, an important step in understanding viral disease prevalence and resistance in crops. Identifying mixed infections, particularly of CMV and CaCV, provides crucial information for improving disease management strategies in pepper breeding programs. Additionally, the study emphasizes the role of symptomatology and molecular diagnostics in screening for resistant germplasm, which can guide future research in plant pathology and resistance breeding. However, to strengthen its impact, more focus on the methodology and confirmation of resistance sources through artificial inoculation would be beneficial.</p> <p>It seems that the authors may have submitted the manuscript hastily, possibly due to some urgency. However, there are essential aspects that must be followed when writing a manuscript. The concept is not clearly articulated, and the discussion section is missing. A thorough review and addressing the following points will significantly improve the quality and make it a publishable research article. Please ensure that all these changes are made before submitting the revised manuscript.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title is brief and precise. However, authors should follow the latest ICTV rules while writing the virus name. (ICTV rules: The virus name is not italicized and first letter of the virus name should be in lower case unless it is written in the start of sentence or if the virus name starts with the proper noun). Here cucumber or capsicum is a common noun, hence, write the virus name in lowercase.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>1. Abstract needs to be reformed. In material methods authors mention they have collected samples from a glasshouse but in abstract they have mentioned it be field? Please do clarify</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>No, some changes have to made in the revised manuscript</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The results and discussion part has to be mentioned after ELISA detection subsection of the Material and Methods 2. Acknowledgment section is missing 3. Competing interest section is missing 4. Authors contribution section is missing <p>All these sections have to be mentioned in the revised manuscript</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Limiting this work to the detection of mixed infections is appropriate. However, claiming to have identified resistance sources in this study is misleading, as no artificial inoculation has been performed. Since the authors detected the presence of viruses using ELISA, it would be more accurate to focus on identifying mixed infections in the germplasm lines rather than claiming to have identified resistance sources. The authors may suggest that the lines showing no symptoms or virus presence can be further evaluated for resistance against viral diseases through artificial inoculation.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Just quoting six references for research article is not enough. Please add more relevant information and add more references</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A major revision is necessary: How can you confidently claim that the lines have not shown positive results as resistant sources without conducting artificial inoculation? The lower virus titre may have prevented virus detection in these lines. Therefore, the identification of resistance sources for these viruses is not applicable in this context. Please focus the study on the detection of mixed infection in the germplasm and refrain from claiming these lines as resistance sources. You may simply state that these lines could potentially be used as resistance sources after artificial inoculation. 2. Introduction section is very poor, some more points have to be added. (Write in detail, cite others works, add proper rationale for your proposed work). Authors say, for “a quick and reliable method for the detection of causal virus is of paramount importance”, how come this signified the work you have done? 3. Please follow the International System of Units (SI) while writing measurement units. For example, in manuscript µl has been mention, it should be written as µL. 4. There are many grammatical errors in the manuscript, it has to be corrected in the revised manuscript 5. There is a significant difference between varieties and breeding lines, yet the manuscript uses "varieties/breeding lines." Please clarify. If your screening panel includes both, specify "and" instead of "or" to accurately reflect their inclusion. 6. Discussion has to be written properly. Authors have discussed only the result part but no supporting information has been added. 7. Overall, the methodology appears appropriate, but providing additional details and ensuring alignment with established protocols will enhance clarity and reproducibility. Always refer to relevant literature and manufacturer guidelines for best practices. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Authors make sure that, always before submitting any research article, line number has to be added in the manuscript. So that, the reviewers can easily comment and also track the changes made after revision.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Shridhar S. Hiremath</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>CSIR- North East Institute of Science and Technology, India</p>