

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_129130 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Screening of horsegram genotypes for resistance against yellow mosaic disease |
| 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 '**lac k of Novel ty**', 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</i> |
|--|---|--|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>R/ interesting research. Pest control is always good research. Improving Yield in food production. A). Poor use of scientific names correctly. B) incorrect tables. Placed at the end of the manuscript. C) tables and figures were provided in the text all joined together and in the wrong order. Placed at the end of the paper. D) many abbreviations were not explained in the text the first time they were indicated.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (if not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>R/ correct title in size. Wrong for listing only the common name of the species, which is incorrect.</p> | |
| <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>/ abstract in accordance with the journal's guidelines, poorer in information. Only 130 words. The conclusions of the work were not listed. Are the abbreviations explained (mars???)?, others</p> | |
| <p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p> | <p>R/ very simple manuscript, more convoluted. By not placing the tables in the normal place of the manuscript, it makes it difficult to understand the results obtained.</p> <p>The tables are very large, which take up more than one page and are therefore incorrectly written.</p> <p>The text only used 6 bibliographical references, and only two from 2022 and another from 2023, the rest are many years out of date. Some of the text's references are wrong.</p> <p>The text only used the scientific name of the species in a complete study once. Therefore only the popular name.</p> <p>Are there two tables without titles at the beginning of the text??</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>R/as already said, there were 6 references and they were published many years ago. Only two are updated. Two from 1968 and 1969; the average without these references = 2014, 10 years late. The number of references should be increased and updated.</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Is the language/english quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Is the quality of the language/english of the article adequate for academic communications? R/the english language used is adequate and allows understanding by the academic public. You should only review some of the words indicated, to analyze whether they are correct or not | |
| Optional/General comments | There are no ethical issues in this manuscript No there are conflicting issues of interest in this manuscript If plagiarism is suspected, provide related evidence or web links. No evidence of plagiarism was found. PLEASE SEE ATACHMENT | |

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: | Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez |
| Department, University & Country | Havana University-Cuba, Cuba |