

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_96370
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Pruning on Disease Incidence and Field Development of a Local Cassava Variety (<i>Manihot esculentus</i> C.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<https://www.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJAHR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	yes yes Can be improved The section on methodology does not flow well and should be redone Yes Some of the references are very old. For instance, the author has referenced paper published in 1990, 1993, 1992, 2011, 1997	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to be reworked	
Optional/General comments	Abstract – the abstract should be worked on and include the scientific steps that were used to do the project. More comments on in the manuscript Introduction – irrelevant information included and does not include the relevant problem (s) that is being addressed Methodology - Consider joining section on Materials and Methods. Reorganize this section completely Results – Poorly done Discussion - Comparable results of effect of pruning on cassava would be meaningful here. Not unless this is the first of its kind work on cassava	

PART 2:

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oliver Okumu
Department, University & Country	University of Nairobi, Kenya