

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JABB_117890
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF SPACING ON SOIL MICROBIAL POPULATION, PEST AND DISEASES INCIDENCE IN COCOA
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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes, the manuscript addresses the impact of different spacing configurations on soil microbial populations and pest and disease incidence in cocoa cultivation, which is important for optimizing agricultural practices. These findings can help improve cocoa yield and sustainability, contributing valuable knowledge to both the scientific community and the agricultural sector.	
2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is somewhat vague and could be more specific to capture the essence of the study. A suggested alternative title is: "Impact of Spacing on Soil Microbial Populations and Pest and Disease Incidence in Cocoa Cultivation"	
3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	The abstract is mostly comprehensive but can be improved for clarity and brevity.	
4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, covering introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and conclusion. However, it would be beneficial to include a separate "Literature Review" section to provide a more detailed background and contextualize the study within existing research.	
5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the methodology and results presented. The data are well-analyzed and the conclusions are supported by the results. However, a more detailed statistical analysis and discussion of potential limitations and biases would strengthen the manuscript.	
6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>	The references are mostly sufficient and recent, but a few additional recent studies could enhance the literature review. Suggested additional references include:  Recent studies on the impact of spacing on crop yields and microbial populations. Latest research on pest and disease management in cocoa cultivation.	
<b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	Introduction: Provide more details on the significance of soil microbial populations in crop health and productivity.  Methods: Include more details on the statistical methods used for data analysis.	

## Review Form 1.7

	Discussion: Discuss the implications of the findings in greater detail, particularly how they can be applied in practical cocoa cultivation. Conclusion: Highlight the potential applications of the study and suggest areas for future research. Figures and Tables: Ensure all figures and tables are clearly labeled and referenced in the text.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	generally suitable for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	M. L. D. D. Randimal
Department, University & Country	The Institute of Knowledge Management, Sri Lanka