

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_124512 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Morpho-Physiological Analysis of Artocarpus lakoocha Roxb Seeds for Improved Storability |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | <i>Artocarpus lakoocha</i> Roxb. is a tropical fruit tree indigenous to India, appreciated for its multifaceted uses. It possesses significant economic potential, although no research has been conducted investigating its storability to enhance post-harvest technology. This research examines the seed storability of the species, emphasizing its morpho-physiological characteristics and desiccation sensitivity. The work is undoubtedly innovative and holds significance for the scientific community. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Yes | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes | |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The manuscript is scientifically correct and robust. All the statistical interpretation done in the study is sufficient and correct as per my review. The figures are also scientifically correct. Delete Table 3 as mentioned in the attached reviewed manuscript. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Recheck references for adhering to the journal formatting. Also delete any references that are more than 20 years old and add some more recent references that are not more than 5 years old. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | The manuscript follows a good academic tone of writing to be published. | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | Please check the attached reviewed manuscript for the minor corrections needed to be done. Those are marked as comments in the manuscript. | |

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: | Ayushman Malakar |
| Department, University & Country | ICFRE – Institute of Forest Productivity, India |