

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123665
Title of the Manuscript:	ARTIFICIAL SEED BIOASSAY FOR ASSESSING PIGEONPEA GENOTYPIC RESISTANCE TO <i>Callosobruchus chinensis</i>
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

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>The manuscript provides a detailed investigation into the resistance of various pigeon pea genotypes to the pulse beetle, <i>Callosobruchus chinensis</i>, using artificial seeds in a controlled bioassay. The study aims to explore resistance mechanisms and suggests potential pathways for breeding more resistant pigeon pea cultivars.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Suggesting improvised title to improve readability "Artificial Seed Bioassay for Assessing Genotypic Resistance of Pigeonpea to <i>Callosobruchus chinensis</i>"</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>Clarify the significance of using artificial seeds in the bioassay and how they differ from natural seeds in the context of resistance studies.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</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>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its clear and methodical approach to investigating genotypic resistance in pigeonpea against <i>Callosobruchus chinensis</i>. The study uses a well-defined artificial seed bioassay under controlled conditions, which allows for a consistent evaluation of oviposition behavior across different genotypes. The experimental design, including the use of a single-choice test and proper statistical analysis with ANOVA and Tukey's HSD test, provides reliable and reproducible results. Additionally, the manuscript thoroughly considers potential factors influencing resistance beyond nutritional content, suggesting a comprehensive understanding of the complexity of pest resistance mechanisms in pigeon pea.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, as it effectively conveys the research objectives, methods, and findings in a clear and concise manner. The manuscript uses appropriate scientific terminology and follows the conventions of academic writing, which makes it accessible to the intended audience. However, there are minor grammatical errors and inconsistencies in sentence structure that need to be addressed to improve overall readability and clarity.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Mukesh Anandrao Laichattiwar
Department, University & Country	Parul University, India