



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_32784
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization and expression analysis of WRKY transcription factors in Groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.,)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In this manuscript, the authors report a comprehensive phylogenetic, protein features, gene structure and motif analysis of WRKY transcription factors in <i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L. In addition, they studied expression profiling of 10 WRKY genes under multi abiotic stress in various tissues. Abstract Line 17 : this sentence is inaccurate. Line 17 : « On other hand » to « on the other hand ». Methods 1- Plant Transcription Factor database contained 28 <i>AhWRKYs</i>. How did authors select 10 <i>AhWRKYs</i> ? More details in selection criteria as threshold score or e-value, identity percentage should be provided. 2- Multiple alignment is performed by clustal, Bioedit is an editor. Results and discussion From the abstract, the authors presented « <i>AhWRKY41</i>	The sentences has been corrected. 10 WRKY TFs were selected based on similarity with stress specific <i>Arabidopsis</i> and <i>Glycine max</i> WRKY TFs



SDI Review Form 1.6

	as a positive regulator in drought/ high temperature/heavy metal ». One may expect that <i>AhWRKY41</i> acts as hub in protein-protein interaction network, but it have no interactor, how authors could explain this? This result should be more explained and discussed. There are recent research papers and comprehensive reviews dedicated to WRKY in peanut, the authors could compare and discuss their results with innovative references. Conclusion Line 293 Insilico to <i>in silico</i> There are many erros and typos. I do encourage the authors to check carefully the manuscript.	We have limited research work conducted on WRKY41 under stress conditions in many crop plants. In addition WRKY41 sequences were fewer in the database, Meanwhile, the un-rooted Phylip analysis will explore the similarity with other WRKY genes. The errors and typos have been corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		