

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_130056
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of begomovirus isolates causing YMD in soybean and analyzing the relation with early reported strains of begomovirus from New Delhi region
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.	The manuscript is important to scientific community as it highlights what should be done to improve the management of viruses in soybean. The scientific community stands to benefit from this paper it is a worthy addition to the body of knowledge. I like this manuscript because as a researcher who has done some work on soybean I have found that diseases and pests lower production, I find the manuscript to be a source of literature that can be cited.	It is one major problem in soybean cultivated area so we focused on this aspects
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	As it is main theme of this work also
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 subtitles should removed from abstract and the abstract written in continuous pros.	I have changed according to comments
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	There are areas that need to be beefed up. In the Results and Discussion subsection there is need to cite the published work that the study conforms to.  The conclusion should also be re-written to indicate what the study found out based on the title of the manuscript	Conclusion was re-written
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	NO. The references should be at least above ten in number	I incorporated more reference in MS
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	Yes
Optional/General comments		

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>  NO.	