

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123835
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of elite bread wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) germplasm for Powdery mildew <i>Blumeria graminis</i> f.sp. <i>tritici</i> resistance
Type of the 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)
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.	This study is highly relevant as it focuses on identifying wheat genotypes resistant to powdery mildew, a major fungal disease affecting global wheat production. By using molecular markers to confirm resistance, the research provides valuable insights for breeding programs aimed at developing more resilient wheat varieties. Ultimately, this contributes to improving food security and promoting sustainable agricultural practices by reducing the need for chemical treatments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Can be rephrased Characterization of Elite Bread Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) Germplasm for Resistance to Powdery Mildew (<i>Blumeria graminis</i> f.sp. <i>tritici</i>)?	
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.	The abstract of the article provides a clear overview of the study, including the aim, methodology, and results, but there are some areas where it can be enhanced for better clarity and comprehensiveness Suggested Additions: 1. Objective Clarification: The abstract mentions that the study aims to confirm resistance using gene-linked markers, but it could briefly explain the significance of identifying resistant genotypes, such as its role in improving wheat varieties and agricultural sustainability. 2. Background Information: A very brief mention of the importance of powdery mildew as a significant threat to wheat production could help set the context for the reader, especially if the abstract stands alone. 3. Implication of Results: While the results section is concise, the abstract could benefit from a concluding sentence that highlights the broader implications of the findings, such as how the characterized genotypes could contribute to future breeding programs or the development of resistant wheat varieties. Suggested Deletions or Modifications: 1. Genotype Details: Listing all genotypes and markers in the abstract makes it feel dense and harder to read. Consider summarizing the results by stating how many genotypes were tested and how many showed resistance, rather than naming each genotype and marker. Technical Jargon: Simplifying certain terms or providing brief explanations (e.g., "epiphytotic conditions") can make the abstract more accessible to a broader audience	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its clear methodology and use of validated molecular markers to confirm resistance to powdery mildew. The selection of SSR markers, which are well-established in genetic studies, strengthens the reliability of the findings. Additionally, the phenotypic data collected under epiphytotic conditions ensures that the resistance observed is relevant to real-world field scenarios. By combining both molecular and field data, the study effectively supports its conclusions, making the research technically comprehensive and scientifically valid.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and correct.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	M T Vasumathi
Department, University & Country	New Horizon College of Engineering, India