

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119558
Title of the Manuscript:	Temporal Dynamics of Induced Defense Enzymes in Finger Millet: Unveiling the Role of Neem Leaf Extract and Brevibacillus brevis in Blast Disease Management
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <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>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Abstract</td> <td>Too many key words. Just 3 to 5 words</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Introduction</td> <td>Good just illustrates the importance of research, not repeating sentences</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Methodology</td> <td>Good</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Results</td> <td>Good</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Discussion and Conclusion</td> <td>Quite good . Unfortunately the discussion is very long. Although it becomes clearer. Conclusion: There are sentences that do not need to be included</td> </tr> <tr> <td>References</td> <td>Some references are too old</td> </tr> </table>	Abstract	Too many key words. Just 3 to 5 words	Introduction	Good just illustrates the importance of research, not repeating sentences	Methodology	Good	Results	Good	Discussion and Conclusion	Quite good . Unfortunately the discussion is very long. Although it becomes clearer. Conclusion: There are sentences that do not need to be included	References	Some references are too old	
Abstract	Too many key words. Just 3 to 5 words													
Introduction	Good just illustrates the importance of research, not repeating sentences													
Methodology	Good													
Results	Good													
Discussion and Conclusion	Quite good . Unfortunately the discussion is very long. Although it becomes clearer. Conclusion: There are sentences that do not need to be included													
References	Some references are too old													
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>														
<p>Optional/General comments</p>														

PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sudi Pramono
Department, University & Country	Universitas Lampung, Indonesia