

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125410
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Different Doses of Nitrogen and Seed Treatment with Biofertilizers on Growth, Yield and Seed Quality of Sunflower (<i>Helianthus annusL.</i>)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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 contributes significantly to the field of sustainable agriculture by evaluating the combined effects of nitrogen doses and biofertilizers on sunflower growth, yield, and seed quality. The results align with the global push for reducing chemical fertilizer dependency and promoting environmentally friendly alternatives, providing practical insights for enhancing sunflower productivity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate and reflects the content of the manuscript accurately. No changes are needed.	
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.	The abstract is well-written and provides a concise summary of the objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions. To improve clarity, consider including specific statistical results (e.g., p-values or percentage increases) to highlight the significance of the findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript follows a logical structure, with clear divisions for introduction, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. The tables provide valuable clarity and enhance the manuscript's readability.	
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 study is scientifically robust. It employs appropriate experimental design (randomized block design with replication) and statistical analysis (ANOVA). The multi-year data strengthens the reliability of the findings. However, a brief discussion on the environmental implications of reducing nitrogen usage through biofertilizers would add depth to the conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and sufficiently recent. The inclusion of studies from 2021 and beyond ensures that the manuscript is up-to-date. If possible, including more recent studies (from 2023-2024) would enhance the literature review.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly suitable for academic communication. However, minor grammatical improvements are recommended. For example, rephrasing repetitive phrases and refining sentence structures (e.g., "Nitrogen is the very much essential plant nutrient...") will improve the overall quality.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Johana Delgado
Department, University & Country	UCAB, Venezuela