

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_130629
Title of the Manuscript:	SCREENING OF BLACK GRAM GENOTYPES FOR RESISTANCE TO WHITEFLY, Bemisia tabaci (GENNADIUS) IN SOUTHERN TELANGANA, INDIA
Type of the 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.	Problem of whitefly on blackgram is well stated. Crop is very important for many states of India> it could be better to mention the whitefly problems of each state where it is grown. It seems there is significant loss from whitefly infestation on blackgram. In this study, conclusion of resistance and susceptibility of genotypes against whiteflies has been drawn based on single year's data which is not so confirmity.	Title of the manuscript itself southern Telangana no need to mention the whitefly problems in all states. This a research work done by a phd student not by any official bodies to do multiple years trails for the confirmation.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	No comments
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.	Abstract is good and comprehensive.	No comments
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	No comments
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Better to add more references.	No comments
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Quality of language is acceptable for reading and understanding.	No comments
Optional/General comments	No comments.	No 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 ethical issues