

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118563
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different levels of cinder and vermicompost on germination and seedling growth of Papaya (Carica papaya c.v Red lady) its treatment with GA3
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>)

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>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is very important for scientific community, as it is showing to us growth parameters that are better for pawpaw growth and development.</p> <p>No, Effect of different levels of cinder and vermicompost on germination and seedling growth of pawpaw (<i>Carica papaya c.v Red lady</i>) treated with Gibberellic acid</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive to a certain extent.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript structures are appropriate</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient but the only shortcoming is in the writing styles.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>As it stands, the language is not suitable for scholarly communication. The author needs to overhaul the language used. Actually, I have corrected the language used to a certain extent in the manuscript.</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:	Esan Adewale Michael
Department, University & Country	University of Ibadan, Nigeria