

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
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.	Characterization of plant pathogens is important for conducting phylogeny and evolutionary studies and finding plant breeding strategies that work against different lineages.	Yes it was our main focus
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is ok	Main theme of work
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.	There is definitely a need to improve the wording, define the acronyms, improve the description of the methodology used and draw conclusions that do not correspond to them. The corresponding feedback was left in the original document.	I have re written in part of MS
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is correct, it follows the scientific method and arrives at the proposed results through the methodology.	I have done needful action
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No. It contains very few references that are very old and the discussion is very poor, based on a single paper. It is suggested to include more recent literature. The software used also needs to be cited according to its creator or creators. The software support indicates how to cite it. I think it would be pertinent to include these papers: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368877885_Molecular_Epidemiology_of_Begomoviruses_Infecting_Mungbean_from_Yellow_Mosaic_Disease_Hotspot_Regions_of_India https://arccjournals.com/journal/legume-research-an-international-journal/LR-5247 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/41944637_Two_new_%27legumoviruses%27_genus_Begomovirus_naturally_infecting_soybean_in_Nigeria/figures?lo=1 https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.03.27.534342.full	I added more reference in this part in MS
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is important to improve the writing, in the original document the respective feedback has been left where the writing is confusing	I tried to reduce confusing part in MS
Optional/General comments	The work is good but requires some improvements to what was proposed in the article, since it has writing problems, very few references which are old, the graphs are poorly described, there is inconsistency between results and methodology for the phylogeny part. It is suggested to take into account the comments made in the original document.	

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>	