

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119298
Title of the Manuscript:	Classical and Molecular Methods of Identification as well as Estimating Nematodes: A Comparative Review
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>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community particularly for new and early career taxonomist in the field. 2. The title might be suitable if the author makes some revisions to the body. 3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. 4. Work needs to be done about the structure of the manuscript. 5. No, I don't think the manuscript is partially correct as there are a lot of major comments which I have added to the manuscripts. The scientific correctness can be fixed if the author addresses these comments. 6. The references are not sufficient. There are a lot of instances where the author needs to provide relevant citations to support the idea they are trying to pass across as these ideas are not in the commonplace. 7. The manuscript needs major reformatting. Starts of paragraphs can be indicated by justifying with one tab, not several spaces. Tables are consuming too many spaces yet have a lot of dead spaces in-between them. I think the author can reformat tables to get rid of the dead spaces. The author should also consider using a smaller line spacing for the tables e.g. 1.5pt spacing. 8. The title of the article and the aim suggest the authors intended to do a comparative review of identification methods of nematodes. However, the manuscript did not try to do this. Other than a couple of tables that highlighted the different methods, the author did not treat each method separately and compare them. It would be beneficial if the author can go beyond table presentation to compare the different techniques of isolation and compare the different techniques of identification and classification 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The language can be improved upon. 2. Precision is very important in scientific communications. Authors should consider the necessity and implication of any adjective before using them. For example, what makes the nematodes mysterious? 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>This study has some merits in that it seeks to compare different techniques used in the isolation, identification and classification of nematodes, a family of worms that are of ecological, agricultural and scientific interests. To further improve the standard, clarity and accuracy of the article, I have included some major and minor 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:	Temitope Awe
Department, University & Country	Illinois State University, USA