

Journal Name:	Journal of Biology and Nature
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOBAN_12484
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of salt tolerant sesame (<i>Sesamum indicum</i> L.) genotypes under invitro condition
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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This research can be taken into consideration in future broad spectrum on field research when taken out as it provides supporting discovery for salt tolerant varieties of sesame which can be cultivated in arid regions.	
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.	It would lead to selection of parents for future crossing programme in the breeding process. In this sentence it should be replaced with “ this research aims to” to make it more clear.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes but discussion part is possible to add highlighting any assumptions or any didderence that can take place in real filed when carrying out experiment with these genotypes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this	It has taken into account a major problem of crop cultivation in arid , semi arid regions. This research can be researched further which make it asset to future researches. The research also included large number of genotypes for the experiment which is also agood thing.	

part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are few and mostly old . I suggest to add references to the conclusion derived from this research if possible as there is cut throat conclusions without any thing to back it up.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Revisions are needed in introduction part. There are sentences which doesnot give meanings and spelling mistakes. There are also grammatical mistakes in abstract as it is sometime in present tense and sometimes past.	
Optional/General comments	It needs more refinement and some extra references and theory addition.	

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:	Kabita Bhat
Department, University & Country	Agriculture and Forestry University, Nepal