

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJOB_99127</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of yard long bean genotypes at varied sowing dates in Sylhet region</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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://www.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, the manuscript is technically sound, but it has some writing issues. The introduction section is not well elaborated, especially the second half.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes. Well structured.</b></p> <p><b>No, but it has the room for improvement.</b></p> <p><b>More references need to be added,</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The English language need minor revisions.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction is part needs revisions, especially the second half part. Concisely describe the relevant literature, and add relevant citations.</li> <li>2. Add the aims and objectives of the study.</li> <li>3. The M&amp;M part says that the experiment was laid out in RCB design, but the results section doesn't have any ANOVA. I have serious concerns about the RCB design, as you have 2 independent factors (Varieties and sowing dates), while the RCB design doesn't fit to it. I strongly suggest to re analyse the data with appropriate statical model for meaningful interpretations.</li> <li>4. The article lacks the discussion potion completely, the R&amp;D section only described the results.</li> </ol>	

### PART 2:

	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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmad Ali
Department, University & Country	College of Plant Science & Technology, Huazhong Agricultural University, China