

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128692
Title of the Manuscript:	Field Screening for Late Leaf Spot resistance in the BC1F4 population in Groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.)
Type of the Article	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: 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</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into identifying groundnut lines resistant to Late Leaf Spot (LLS), a major fungal disease. The findings contribute to developing disease-resistant cultivars, improving crop productivity and sustainability. Using advanced breeding techniques, the study lays the foundation for addressing biotic stresses in groundnut, benefiting breeders and researchers working on global food security.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>If the title is "Field Screening for Late Leaf Spot resistance in the BC1F4 population in Groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.)," it is generally appropriate for the content described in the manuscript. However, you might consider minor adjustments to make it more concise or reflective of key findings.</p> <p>Here are a couple of suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. "Field Screening for Late Leaf Spot Resistance in BC1F4 Groundnut Lines (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.)"<ul style="list-style-type: none">o This is slightly more concise while maintaining the core message.2. "Identification of Late Leaf Spot Resistance in BC1F4 Groundnut Lines (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.)"<ul style="list-style-type: none">o This version emphasizes the identification aspect of the research. <p>Both options are suitable, but your choice depends on whether you want to focus on the screening process or the identification of resistance.</p>	

[Review Form 3](#)

<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>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, but there are some areas that could be refined for clarity, conciseness, and completeness. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>Suggestions for Addition or Clarification:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objective of the Study: The abstract mentions the identification of resistant lines, but it could benefit from a clearer statement of the study's primary objective at the beginning. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "This study aimed to evaluate 115 BC1F4 groundnut lines for resistance to Late Leaf Spot (LLS)." Brief Mention of Methods: A very brief mention of the methodology could be included, especially the field screening process, to make it clearer how the screening was done. For instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The lines were evaluated in single-plant progeny rows under natural disease conditions." Quantification or Specific Results: Including specific details like how many lines showed resistance or moderate resistance earlier in the abstract would make it more data-driven. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Two lines were identified with resistance, while four lines showed moderate resistance based on disease scores." Future Implications: The abstract should emphasize the potential implications of these findings for future breeding programs and how this contributes to the broader goal of improving groundnut resistance to fungal diseases. You can briefly add: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "These lines will be advanced to the next generation and tested in multi-location trials to further assess their resistance and potential for use in breeding programs." <p>Suggestions for Deletion or Refinement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Redundant Phrasing: The phrase "In the present study from 115 lines two lines were resistance and four lines were moderate resistance were identified" could be reworded for clarity and conciseness. A simplified version might be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Two lines showed resistance, and four lines showed moderate resistance." Excessive Detail on Methodology: Some details about the timing (e.g., "at 75th, at 90th, and at 105th days after planting") may not be necessary for the abstract unless it's crucial to the results. You can generalize the timing or simply mention that "evaluation was done at multiple stages." 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically correct overall. It accurately describes <i>Nothopassalora personata</i> as the cause of Late Leaf Spot (LLS) and the use of BC1F4 lines for screening disease resistance. The methodology of using single-plant progeny rows is valid, but more details on disease scoring and environmental conditions would strengthen the study. The use of molecular markers is mentioned, but additional clarification on their application would be beneficial. Consistency in terminology and clearer definitions of resistance levels would also improve the manuscript's clarity. Overall, the study is scientifically sound, but more specifics would enhance its completeness.</p> <p>Suggested Improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Clarify how disease resistance was quantified and what criteria were used to categorize 	

Review Form 3

	<p>the lines as resistant or moderately resistant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Provide additional context on environmental factors (disease pressure, field conditions, etc.) to give readers a better understanding of how the screening was conducted. □ Ensure consistent use of terminology and definitions, particularly when discussing disease resistance and scoring methods. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references seem not sufficient and could benefit from more recent studies, particularly in areas such as molecular markers for disease resistance, breeding techniques for Late Leaf Spot (LLS) resistance, and groundnut production under changing climate conditions.</p> <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recent Advances in Molecular Markers: 2. Groundnut Disease Resistance Breeding: 3. Impact of Climate Change on Groundnut Production: 4. Also add discussion part <p>Including such references would provide a more updated and comprehensive context for the study, reinforcing its scientific relevance and grounding it in the most recent research.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas for improvement. Some sentences could be simplified for clarity and flow. Grammar issues, such as missing articles and subject-verb agreement, should be corrected. Consistency in terminology is important, especially when discussing resistance levels. Minor revisions for precision and sentence structure will enhance readability and overall quality, making it more appropriate for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Based on the provided excerpts, there don't appear to be any competing interest issues mentioned. However, potential conflicts should be disclosed, such as funding sources, author affiliations, or product endorsements. If no conflicts exist, a statement confirming "The authors declare no competing interests" should be included in the manuscript.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Monika Jangra
Department, University & Country	Chaudhary Bansi Lal University, India