

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122873
Title of the Manuscript:	A review on molecular mechanism of plant immunity against fungal pathogens.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 publication is not what I would call a review article because it is devoid of important components that are necessary for effectively summarizing and synthesizing complex information, such as flow diagrams, tables, and charts. These resources are essential in a review because they enable readers to rapidly assimilate the key ideas, contrast results, and comprehend the connections among various studies. The manuscript feels lacking in them and is less successful in getting its point across.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Decoding Plant Defense: Molecular Mechanisms Underlying Immunity Against Fungal Pathogens"	
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.	It should be short as given below: The defense mechanism of plants against fungal infections is a multifaceted, intricate system that includes effector-triggered immunity (ETI) and pattern-triggered immunity (PTI). Through the identification of important resistance (R) genes and the discovery of how proteins and metabolites are mobilized during attacks, advances in genomes, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics have contributed to our knowledge of these mechanisms. CRISPR-Cas9 and other gene editing technologies present fresh possibilities for boosting immunity. Ongoing difficulties are brought on by the dynamic nature of fungal infections and climate change. In order to guarantee global food security and sustainable agriculture, future research should concentrate on creating resilient, climate-resilient crops through creative resistance techniques.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Make Terminology Clear: To help readers who are not familiar with the subject, make sure that all technical terminology, such as "pattern-triggered immunity (PTI)" and "effector-triggered immunity (ETI)," are described explicitly early in the book.</p> <p>Enhance Structure: Before moving on to gene editing technologies, consider combining topics on genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics together for better flow.</p> <p>Improve Visual Aids: To effectively explain difficult ideas and highlight important points, add additional visual aids like flowcharts, tables, and diagrams. This is especially important in sections that cover molecular mechanisms and resistance tactics.</p> <p>Expound on Limitations: Give a brief explanation of any possible restrictions or difficulties pertaining to the techniques and technologies discussed, such as the real-world issues associated with using CRISPR-Cas9 in crop breeding.</p> <p>Update References: Make sure all citations are current .</p> <p>flow diagrams, tables, and charts. These resources are essential in a review because they enable readers to rapidly assimilate the key ideas, contrast results, and comprehend the connections among various studies</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>Amit Kumar Tiwari</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Bundelkhand University, India</p>