

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_131187
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparing the Dibbling and Drilling Techniques in Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) based on the plants' Reproductive and Vegetative Growth
Type of the Article	Original research article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.

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 Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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.	This article presents a well-structured scientific research comparing drilling and dibbling sowing method. It addresses the area of optimising sowing methods for enhance Agricultural productivity. It also presents a research with clear experimental design with relevant and adequate agronomical data. Hence, this research add to the body of knowledge on sowing wheat and contribute towards attainment of food sufficiency.	Thanks for the comments
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thanks for the comments
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.	Yes, the research gap need to be included	Thanks for the comments
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, enhanced plant spacing improved optimum leaf development that will trap needed sunlight for photosynthesis and ultimately increase crop yield.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references were comprehensive, relevant and recent, since the research was carried out in 2017-2018 season.	Ok
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript excellently addresses optimising wheat sowing method comparing dibbling and drilling with scientific facts. It is suitable for publication pending effecting some minor corrections. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	Noted thanks

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>	