

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_116138</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Understanding Morpho-Physiological Traits Conveying Preharvest Sprouting Tolerance in Mungbean Varieties</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1) This manuscript has potential for publication. However, I suggest that revision be made before final submission. I recommend a moderate revision for some points I've raised.</p> <p>2) The research title did show some scientific relevance. However, the title used in the abstract is more accurate.</p> <p>3) The abstract is comprehensive. It follows the typical steps (Problem, subject, method, treatment of data, findings and applications).</p> <p>4) Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The introduction and the conclusion are short but since the whole manuscript is relatively short, in terms of structure this is fine.</p> <p>5) Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct and adds value that can be used to improve the crop. However, some statements need references. In the methodology section, methods used to collect data should be clearly described to ensure repeatability. In the results section a better description of the data et more discussion is needed.</p> <p>6) The references are not sufficient and more recent references are needed, please see the manuscript for details.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Please harmonize the use of capital letters in titles.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adelaïde P. Ouedraogo
Department, University & Country	Burkina Faso