

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_116576
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Growing Media on Seed Germination, Seedling Growth And Establishment of Papaya (Carica papaya L.) cv. Red Lady
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. The manuscript provides information with importance for the scientific community. Innovative production practices on papaya cultivation should be disseminated.</p> <p>Yes. The authors provided a suitable title for the said article.</p> <p>The abstract was all over the place. It was unclear what treatment provided the best results during the study</p> <p>The introduction part lacks substantial review regarding the production practices in connection with the treatments being studied. A lot of unnecessary information were provided which are vaguely connected to the study objectives. I highly suggest revision of this part.</p> <p>In the methodology, I was confused on why the authors only provided data gathering methods on germination but did not on other parameters.</p> <p>As for the results and discussion, I did not see properly presented and statistically validated results. I barely see any discussion as well. What I see were bulleted list of results with no statistical validation. I highly recommend for the authors to review how a scientific article should be presented and discussed. The article overall was poorly made.</p> <p>I could not make a validation on the scientific merit of the article. It was lacking and does need a lot more revision to be considered.</p> <p>No. References were too outdated given the context of the study. I highly suggest thorough investigation of the subject matter and provide the most recent advancements in connection of the treatments being studied.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. There is too much of grammatical error and discussion were poorly structured. I highly recommend consulting an English proficient expert to improve this matter.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Overall, the study was poorly made. I hope the authors would try to refer on existing published articles and be guided in writing their manuscript.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bryan Glomel S. Silverio
Department, University & Country	Center for High Value Crops, University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines, Philippines