

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128692
Title of the Manuscript:	Field Screening for Late Leaf Spot resistance in the BC1F4 population in Groundnut ( <i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.)
Type of the 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important to the community as it provides information about LLS been the major cause of poor yield or yield loss and how to develop resistance line for breeding purposes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 not comprehensive enough as important details about the methods, findings and summary of the result are not well captured. There should be no citation of authors and year in the abstract, all authors should be removed. The use of English in line 8 should be corrected and constructed properly for better understanding.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes. However, the body or content should be developed appropriately. For all in-text citations with more than two authors, a comma should follow the full stop after the et al. They were captured incorrectly from the first citation of Pat et al., to Kishore et al., A numbering of 2.0 should be written before materials and methods. There's a typographical error in section 3.1 'two lines' should be removed. The preposition 'was' used in line 2 of section 3.1 should be changed to 'were'. Table 2 written on the last line in section 3.1 should be deleted.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient. However, APA style should be followed correctly as some references are not in alphabetical order (the last reference). Also, Mace et al., was not cited in the body of the work but was referenced while Mac 2000 was cited in-text but was not referenced.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript lacked formatting as the content is not aligned in some cases.	

#### 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:	Ishegbe Joyce Eko
Department, University & Country	Bingham University Karu, Nigeria