

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119587
Title of the Manuscript:	Heat Stress in Maize: Understanding the Physiological and Biochemical Impacts
Type of the Article	Review

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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Manuscript is important for the scientific community but it needs major revision. Content needs to be improved by adding tables for different work done in this field, major physiological and biochemical changes should be listed in a tabular form , there must be final conclusion and future prospect of the work.</p> <p>2. yes</p> <p>3. Abstract is too lengthy</p> <p>4. No, conclusion and future prospect should be there</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The manuscript contains some outdated references. Unless these are foundational or groundbreaking studies with little follow-up research on the same topic, please check if these can be replaced with more timely, recent sources.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Manuscript needs major revision, as the review article should give whole idia of the topic, but this manuscript lack that. Some table and few more figures should be included.</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:	Hemlata Singh
Department, University & Country	Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural Univeristy, India