

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_127936
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF NEWLY DEVELOPED BIDI TOBACCO (NICOTIANA TABACUM L.) GENOTYPES FOR SEED OIL
Type of the Article	Considered the article for short communication or short notes

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: 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)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is suitable for publication in Annual Research & Review in Biology	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Appropriate	
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.	Correction was carried out in the edited MS	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not sufficient, Kindly include more recent references in the MS	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is suitable for short communication and or Research Note	

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:	P.Sivakumar
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India