

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_76767
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Agromorphological characterization of a collection of <i>Senna obtusifolia</i> (L.) in Burkina Faso</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The study titled “ <b>Agromorphological characterization of a collection of <i>Senna obtusifolia</i> (L.) in Burkina Faso</b>” is an original study. There is not much work done on this subject. However, some deficiencies need to be eliminated in order for the study to be published. First of all, the English language of the article should be completely re-examined and grammatical and spelling mistakes should be corrected.</p> <p>In the study, no units (cm, mm, pieces, etc.) were specified in any of the measurements made to determine the development and condition of the plants mentioned in the Data collection section and all tables were made in this way. What these values are should be shown. For example, what Table 1 tells us is not an adequate explanation. These tables need to be talked about. So what will the reader understand from this table? It is necessary to make explanations emphasizing which values to pay attention to.</p> <p>Figures should be expressed with more scientific photographs. For example, a complete view of the plant is not given. There are very close-up shots and they need to be edited more carefully.</p> <p>The discussion part is very simple and short written, it needs to be developed.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mehmet Sezgin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Çankırı Karatekin University, Turkey</b>