

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
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	Research

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 research findings characterizes the 26 genotypes of black gram against whitefly pest resistance with two check genotypes. Significance of this research is the identification of resistance and susceptible genotypes helps breeders for developing new varieties of black gram to maintain whitefly population below ETL.	I have already mentioned the importance and outcome of the research work in the conclusion and also in the introduction
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	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.	Yes	No comments
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, manuscript is very nicely written by the Authors. Easy to understand, follow and no errors.	No comments
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	No comments
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	No comments
Optional/General comments	Results and Discussion: ➤ Modify: These results are <u>consistent with the findings of Sekar and</u> ➤ From the Table-4 Out of(Table 4). Conclusion: ➤ It is concluded that Black..... (Already under head- Conclusion...neednot to mention again)	Yes modified and highlighted in the original manuscript

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	No ethical issues