

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_128980
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of sesame entries against Phyllody disease under field conditions
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a critical issue in sesame cultivation by evaluating resistance to phyllody disease, a major yield constraint. It contributes to the scientific understanding of genetic resistance in sesame germplasm, which is crucial for breeding programs targeting disease resilience. The findings provide practical insights for sustainable crop management and highlight potential entries for further genetic improvement. This study is a valuable resource for researchers, agronomists, and policymakers working on oilseed crop improvement.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title Screening of sesame entries against Phyllody disease under field conditions is appropriate but could be more concise and engaging. Suggested alternative Field Screening of Sesame Germplasm for Resistance to Phyllody Disease.	
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 comprehensively summarizes the study but could benefit from minor revisions for clarity and emphasis. Including a brief mention of the methodology (e.g., RCB design, phyllody disease rating scale) would enhance its completeness. Additionally, emphasizing the significance of the findings for breeding programs would strengthen its impact.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically accurate, with a robust methodology and clear results. The findings are well-supported by data and align with established scientific principles in plant pathology and crop improvement.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and provide adequate support for the study. However, checking for the inclusion of the most recent studies on sesame phyllody disease and phytoplasma-associated research could add more depth. Suggested additions include recent works on phytoplasma management and sesame breeding strategies.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The references are relevant and provide adequate support for the study. However, checking for the inclusion of the most recent studies on sesame phyllody disease and phytoplasma-associated research could add more depth. Suggested additions include recent works on phytoplasma management and sesame breeding strategies.	
Optional/General comments	Providing more context about the geographical relevance of the study and its broader implications could enhance its impact	

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:	K. Suresh Kumar
Department, University & Country	Mother Theresa Institute of Engineering and Technology, India