

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_120128
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE PHYSIOLOGICAL AND AGRONOMIC PERFORMANCE OF NEW SESAME VARIETIES (SESAMUM INDICUM L.) INTRODUCED IN BURKINA FASO
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	The manuscript is very relevant to the area of agricultural sciences. It presents relevant contributions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	Yes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1 - In my opinion yes! But I believe that another reviewer with greater expertise in the language could contribute more.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the introduction, the author mentions that the "Sesame variety is accessible to everyone, especially women.... "this statement is disconnected from the general understanding of the text. There was a lack of relevant information for this quote to make sense in the context in which it was written. • The author can cite more information regarding the climate and the difficulties that this "<i>Climate x variety</i>" relationship can impact - in general. • The illustrations greatly contribute to the data analysis, excellent. • The tables and graphics are excellent quality. 	

Review Form 1.8

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:	Juliana Neves Barbosa
Department, University & Country	Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica de Minas Gerais, Brazil