



I. K. Press

Journal Name:	<u>PLANT CELL BIOTECHNOLOGY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY</u>
Manuscript Number:	Original_Manuscript_PCBMB_12164
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the biochemical alterations in mungbean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilczek) caused by the Mungbean Yellow Mosaic India Virus (MYMIV)
Type of the Article	

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only based on 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer thinks is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://www.ikpress.org/index.php/index/editorial-guideline>



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Abstract should be revised according to journal format and guidelines for writing an abstract.2. Author(s) should clarify very clearly which statistical analysing design they have used in this study.3. I would like to see ANOVA table in the text.4. Please bring mean comparisons and explain which method you have used to comapare them.5. Discussion part seems weak. Do more attempt to compare with previous studies in this fireld.	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fair enough	
<p><u>Optional</u> comments</p>		



J. K. Press

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Farshid Talat
Department, University & Country	Iran