

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_104474
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological Characterisation and Cyanide Content Determination in Phaseolus lunatus Linn. (Lima Beans) Accessions
Type of the 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:

<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p><i>Positive Comments:</i> The abstract is good. The abstract is informative and relevant. Key words are appropriate.</p> <p>Introduction is okay. It is clear what is known about the topic. The research question is clearly defined. The aim is clear.</p> <p>Materials and method are fair enough. The process of subject selection is clear. The variables are defined and measured appropriately. The study methods are valid and reliable. There is enough detail in order to replicate the study.</p> <p>Results are well written. The data is presented in an appropriate way. Tables and figures are relevant and clearly presented. It is clear about the significant result. It is clear about the meaningful result.</p> <p>Discussion and Conclusion is well written. The results are discussed from multiple angles. The conclusions answer the aims of the study.</p> <p>The conclusions are supported results.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Manuscript still contains of typo, spelling, and grammatical errors. All these mistakes must be corrected by Author before publishing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><i>Constructive Comments:</i> The research done is innovative, has a good structure and data analysis. The manuscript can be accepted with minor corrections. <u>Some detailed comments and suggestions are given in comment box in MS File, attached</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Darwin Pangaribuan
Department, University & Country	Lampung University, Indonesia