

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_97455
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of Nutrient Dense Potato Genotypes in High Hills of Karnali Province, Nepal
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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> <p>Poor discussion needs to re write this part.</p>	<p>1. The manuscript has a scientific impotence to solve the agricultural productivity of the target country. But, the field experiment was conducted before 5 years (2017 &amp; 2018). So your data is also old and how you can update the target objective with the data collected before 5 years, sitting on 2023?</p> <p>2. Yes! With minor modification. Yes! But, The authors didn't put the experimental materials background well, such as pedigree, original source, maturity etc.</p> <p>3. Yes!</p> <p>4. Need minor modifications</p> <p>5. Requires minor amendment as given in the manuscript body</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient but the author should follow the guideline of the journal.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes!	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>To release a given variety to public within breeding pipeline; it needs from 6-8 years.</p> <p>Unless the variety may give high yield at a time and become segregated</p> <p>In this case the authors use only two locations and two seasons which will be 4 in total and difficult to release a variety.</p>	

### 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Temesgen Teressa
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia