

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_129645
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Yield and Fibre Traits in Newly Developed Bt and Non-Bt Cotton Hybrids
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	<b>New varieties of cotton was developed for yield and better fibre quality. These new developments will add values to farmers, scientists and the global community where cotton is imported and exported.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Okay</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>Author should check the corrected abstract.</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically correct but author need to explain more on how the hybrids were developed since there was more energy on it, in the manuscript. We need detail on the fibre quality check that was done. It is necessary for fibres to be taken to the laboratory for tensile strength to be able to determine the quality ratio to affirm fibre quality but this is not mentioned.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Atta and Owolarafe, 2023; The Development and Performace Evaluation of a Kenaf Spining and Reeling Machine Atta et al (2024). Quality Ratio Comparison of Yarn Spun from here Different Varieties of Kenaf Samad et al(2002)	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Fair enough but needs to be rechecked.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Author should come out better in methodology</b>  <b>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</b>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Atta Adekunle Temidayo</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria</b>