

Journal Name:	<a href="#">PLANT CELL BIOTECHNOLOGY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PCBMB_12292
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative Analysis of Peroxidase and Catalase Isoenzymes via Native-PAGE Electrophoresis and SDS-PAGE Profiling of Leaf Proteins in Rice Varieties under Infection Stress</b>
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>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The first thing that seems important about this manuscript is that the type of this manuscript is not clear. Especially since this manuscript has only 4 references. Nevertheless, it is a good and useful manuscript. New techniques have been used. And the methods used are well described.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and	The manuscript in question is a research work that has been done very carefully and is explained very carefully and in detail. And it seems that the authenticity of its contents has been confirmed. However, more description of the sunjects, especially about the mechanisms, and having a strong discussion will help to improve the quality	

technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	of the manuscript	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Firoozeh Chamandoosti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Iran</b>