

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119170
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on self-incompatibility in mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i> L.) germplasm
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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into self-incompatibility in mango germplasm, which is crucial for improving mango breeding and cultivation practices to enhance fruit set and yield.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the main focus of the study, which is the examination of self-incompatibility in mango germplasm.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Randomised Block Design (RBD): Provide more details on why RBD was chosen and how it specifically addresses variability in the field.</p> <p>Check Cultivars: Briefly describe the characteristics of the check cultivars used and why they were chosen as controls.</p> <p>Bagging Methodology:</p> <p>Flower Removal: Explain the rationale for removing opened flowers before bagging.</p> <p>Time Frame: Justify the choice of 15 days for recording the fruit set. Could extending or varying the observation period provide additional insights?</p> <p>Statistical Analysis:</p> <p>Include a section detailing the statistical methods used to analyze the data. Specify if ANOVA or other tests were used, and mention any post-hoc tests applied.</p> <p>Mention how the data was checked for normality and homogeneity of variances before conducting ANOVA.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the paper appear suitable for scholarly communication, with a clear presentation of experimental details and findings related to mango self-incompatibility.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Hrithik Dey
Department, University & Country	Lloyd Institute of Management and Technology, India