

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_105647
Title of the Manuscript:	Tandem effect of bio-fortification on Dry matter content and gari yield of some yellow root cassava varieties
Type of the 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://journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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)
<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>I consider that the article is important for the scientific community</p> <p>The title is appropriate</p> <p>The summary is highly understandable</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the article is appropriate</p> <p>Yes, I consider that the article is correct from the scientific point of view</p> <p>The references are sufficient</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the English used is adequate for the academic article</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Remove yellow highlight</p> <p>Section number added</p> <p>Section added</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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>Nau Silverio Niño Gutiérrez</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Autonomous University of Guerrero, Mexico</b>