

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119066
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Morphological Traits in Annona Hybrids
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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"> The manuscript is very important. The study evaluated phenotypic diversity in Annona hybrids; this can aid in breeding programs aimed at improving fruit quality and adaptability. The title is suitable. The abstract is not comprehensive enough. The abstract needs proper structuring: A brief background, objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. The results should present key findings: mentioning exact values or ranges for traits where significant variability was observed would be more informative. The subsections need further improvement: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction: No clear statement of the problem. This generally lacks flow. Materials and methods: the specific morphological data evaluated should be stated. Include analysis of variance and posthoc test in the study. Results and discussion: There are many of redundant information that needs to be revised. The manuscript is scientifically correct. The references are sufficient. However, a reference was not listed. The format of the listed references was inconsistent. Some are too old. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The language is suitable.	
<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> <p>No</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abiola Toyin Ajayi
Department, University & Country	Adekunle Ajasin University, Nigeria