

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124174
Title of the Manuscript:	Disease Indexing of Rapeseed - Mustard Cultivars against Alternaria blight
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it tries to help sort out the types of rapeseed mustard that can be planted to produce maximum yield with the least loss due to infection from Alternaria blight. This result can help improve the farmer and community economies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable but could be improved	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	A line of introduction to the topic should be added at the beginning of the abstract. The methodology is not featured in the abstract and a conclusion should be included.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The tables in this manuscript should be written in a scientific format. The result section is not written clearly and does not give a good reading or understanding of the results. Two species of Alternaria are usually responsible for Alternaria blight, the author did not state which species was investigated which should be accompanied with pictures. The conclusion should be a clear statement giving a definite conclusion to the research. The author only repeated the results in the conclusion. An improvement in the grammatical constructions and punctuation could improve the quality of the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript could be improved by using more references which will make it technically more robust. There was no reference to the origin of the method used for the experiment or the improvements or adjustments made to the method.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English Language should be improved to meet the standard suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	This research was well structured but was not well presented in the manuscript. The real value of the work done will be appreciated if the presentation and the grammar is improved.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oyekemi Akinmusire
Department, University & Country	University of Maiduguri, Nigeria