

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118178
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and yield of summer sesamum (Sesamum indicum L.) as influenced by varying organic nutrient management practices
Type of the 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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable for scholarly communication</p> <p>3. The abstract is not comprehensive. It lacks conclusion and recommendation, also I have made some corrections in the abstract. The author should go through the manuscript and effect other corrections.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structures of the article are okay.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient, the introduction and methodology aspects lack references</p> <p>7. Conclusion: when you have conclusion, then you should come up with recommendation. The subheading should be conclusion and recommendation. Please include recommendation and let it reflect in your abstract.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the English used in this article is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The author insures all corrections are made before publication.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rejoice James Mshelizah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal university of Agriculture, Nigeria</b>