

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118854
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Cold plasma seed treatment on physiological and biochemical changes in aged Mustard seed variety-RH0749
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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"> 1. The manuscript could be important for the scientific community as well as policy makers/decision makers to review strategies and to plan for interventions that can boost crop production that will in turn ensure food security in the country and economic boost. 2. The title appears to be long but is catchy and sound. 3. Not encouraging efforts have been made to come up with an Abstract that highlights major points of the research. Note that an Abstract is supposed to be a summary of what is in the main document and as such, you need to review the main document. The Author is, therefore, requested to review it all and concentrate on the facts that are of significant to the objective of the study and the findings. This could also include the challenges and proposed way forward. 4. The structure of the Manuscript appears to be a traditional one and is in order. I would, however, request the Author to rework on the Sections on Results and Discussions as I feel there is a mix up facts. Consider a change on the presentation of results and not making it as a fixed template. 5. I feel the manuscript is scientifically correct as it has in most cases been backed with relevant studies, data and references. 6. Note that some of the facts presented in the document need to be backed up by references and this has been mentioned in the track changes of the document (See comments in track changes). <p>The Manuscript has a total of only 29 references on the list and not all of them have been used in the document. It should also be noted that some used in the document are not there on the list.</p> <p>References appearing on the list but not in the document are 8 and 12. Those in the document but not on the list include the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justice and Bass, 1978 • Anon., 2015 • Chrispeels and Varma, 1967 <p>The conclusion part needs to be reviewed and it should be consistent with what was supposed to be provided for in the whole document. I feel the issues related to the work have not been spelt out clearly from the word go. This could be in line of providing the aim, main objective and specific objectives. This was an opportunity for the author to justify the study, therefore, the idea was supposed to be clearly re-stated and supported according to the findings.</p> <p>All the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols should be written in full followed by the abbreviations/acronyms themselves when they appear in the document for the first time, thereafter, the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols can be used.</p> <p>Consider numbering all the Sections including the reference Section or adding page numbers for easy referencing. Numbering of sub-sections in the Sections under Material and Methods and Results and Discussion need to be considered for easy referencing. There is also need for introductory remarks for some of the sub-sections to prepare the reader on what is expected.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>There is need to rework on the Tables according to the subsections to avoid confusion i.e. they should be located closer to where they have been mentioned and introduced for better referencing not the way it has been done in this manuscript. While on the same, you may wish to consider including figures that can help to illustrate trend for dosage and time.</p> <p>In general, the study has not properly been introduced under the Introduction Section to explain some of the terms used for easy understanding of the concept. Some of the terms used in the document need to be defined e.g. Plasma in general as well as what is means by Low temperature plasma, cold plasma etc</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The answer could be no as well as yes and comments have been made to this regard. Please refer to the comments in track changes.</p> <p>Proofreading of the whole document to correct the grammar, typos, tenses etc including rephrasing/reconstruction need to be enhanced.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>All the sections need to be reworked and provide relevant information as per the comments that are in track changes.</p> <p>Avoid short and long sentences that could be confusing and not connecting well to pass on the intended message.</p> <p>It is a good study that can help both the government and community in being focused and in changing their policy direction towards crop production to march up with the demand due to population growth. However, there is a need to provide more details to the study and this should include well spelled out problems/challenges as well as the proposed way forward based on the experience generated from the study and other studies done in the region and beyond as evidenced by the references included.</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:	James Peaches Phiri
Department, University & Country	Malawi