

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124875
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between Pulp Weight and Physio-Biochemical Attributes of Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>Importance: This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the correlations between pulp weight and physio-biochemical traits in mango for improving fruit quality and aiding mango breeding programs. Additionally, the investigation into diverse germplasms contributes to the broader understanding of mango physiology, supporting efforts to enhance cultivar development and optimize fruit production.</p> <p>Reasons for like:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study explores an important relationship between pulp weight and other physio-biochemical traits, which is crucial for improving mango fruit quality. 2. The use of diverse germplasms strengthens its scientific relevance and applicability to mango research focusing on improving fruit quality. 3. The statistical methods used, such as regression and correlation analysis, are appropriate for the research objectives, adding credibility to the findings. <p>Limitations: I think the manuscript could have provided more detailed explanations or insights into the reasons behind the significant biochemical correlations, which would have strengthened the discussion and the overall understanding of the results.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Correlation Between Pulp Weight and Physio-Biochemical Traits in Mango (Mangifera indica L.) Germplasms</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive, but it could be improved by clarifying the significance of the study's aim for mango breeding,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please give the similar information about 30 germplasms/ 28 germplasms and 2 commercially grown cultivars in the aim & methodology. 2. Provide more details on the measurement techniques for TSS and acidity in the methodology 3. Authors should provide supporting evidence or references for the potential markers mentioned in the conclusion to clarify their application in breeding programs aimed at improving mango fruit quality and pulp content. 4. Mention the statistical analysis tools used would enhance the overall clarity and relevance of the abstract. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Well-structured but the methodology for observed parameters lacks detail, particularly for TSS and acidity (No unit is used), making it difficult to assess the reliability of the findings.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through statistical analyses, ensuring the reliability of the results. The correlation analyses offer meaningful insights into the relationships between pulp weight and physio-biochemical traits, contributing valuable knowledge to inform future research and breeding programs in mango cultivation.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and mostly recent. However, if the authors expand the discussion, it may require the inclusion of additional references to support their findings.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's content is valuable, but the English quality needs improvement for clarity and scholarly communication. I recommend revising grammar and sentence structure. This will ensure that the findings are communicated to the readers clearly and effectively.	
Optional/General comments	I strongly suggest that the authors should expand the discussion section, as it is currently quite limited. Providing more insights and context regarding the findings would greatly enhance the manuscript.	

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:	Ananya Khatun
Department, University & Country	Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Bangladesh