

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_112193
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the agronomic performance of two sesame accessions (<i>Sesamum indicum L.</i>): The case of local accession (of Central African origin) and Pakr�ssaya accession (of Burkinabe origin).
Type of the Article	

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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, as it's highlighting the agronomic performance of two varieties of sesame.</p> <p>No, it should be a comparative study rather than an evaluation because evaluation word is not suited as the experiment is not done at various places and replications.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Yes, but Choice of Study site to be replaced as Study Area, no information about type of soil and number of irrigations given in experimental data, all the Package of practices followed should be well tabulated for both accessions.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Sufficient but, no proper Style of referencing was followed.</p> <p>Follow one single style of referencing. Year and origin, Quantity in yield in table is not appropriate, Revise the table Experimental Setup should be written more scientifically</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Experimental Setup section should we revised and written again with proper scientific writing, All activites should be explained briefly. Language should be more scientific.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In statistics part there is no proper reasoning that the data is following normal distribution or not. Give value of any test for normality or kurtosis and skewness values which indicates the normality of the distribution which can be justified for use of Wilcoxon test.</p> <p>T test values or Wilcoxon test values are not given in a correct tabulated format for comparing the differences.</p> <p>Patial Correlation values are not mentioned anywhere, how its relationship with yield is justified in the study?</p> <p>The last two sentences in the conclusion are irrelevant the study, why did knowledge and Behaviour come in an agronomic evaluation?</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:	Adupa Shanmuka
Department, University & Country	India