

ReviewForm

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122537
Title of the Manuscript:	Insilico Analysis of Rpp1 Locus-Derived NB-ARC-LRR Domains Reveals Insights into Rust Resistance in Soybean
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	The insilico analysis of the Rpp1 locus-derived NB-ARC-LRR domains provides critical insights into the genetic mechanisms underlying rust resistance in soybean. By examining these domains, researchers can identify key genetic markers associated with disease resistance, aiding in the development of rust-resistant soybean varieties. This study is important as it advances our understanding of plant immunity, potentially leading to more resilient crops and improved agricultural productivity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes (however the language of the abstract needs to be better and improved.)	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. Some sub-sections are not numbered. This needs to be corrected.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The method used for the analysis is accurate. 2. The importance of the study is also well highlighted. 3. Proper figures have been provided to support the study 4. The gene mentioned and also the protein expression study along with the pipeline followed for the study is good. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No. Many old references are being used. References are not cited in a proper way. Kindly use APA or Harvard-style references. Add new and recent references, and remove the old ones.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the study is average, the language can be made better.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figures need to be clear 2. Figure 5 is not mentioned in the manuscript 3. Figures 6A and 6B are nowhere to be found, there is only Figure 6 4. The uniprot ID that was used needs to be mentioned, other IDs are also required 5. I would ask the authors how novel this study is, and how this study is different from the rest in the techniques used. 6. Tables need to be added as well. The paper has no tables. 7. The alignment of the pictures are also not correct kindly fix them. 	

ReviewForm

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:	Avirup Panja
Department, University & Country	Amity University, India