

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125070
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of tuber yield parameters of red skinned advance potato (<i>Solanum tuberosum</i> L.) clones in Eastern Indo-Gangetic plains of India
Type of the Article	Agricultural paper

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 manuscript is important in selection of varieties for production. Potatoes are very rich in nutrients such as carbohydrate, amino acid, vitamins, minerals, anti-oxidant, dietary fibers, and protein. It is also important for food security.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No "Evaluation of tuber yield and yield parameters of red skinned advance potato (<i>Solanum tuberosum</i> L.) clones in Eastern Indo-Gangetic plains of India"	
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 it is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 part.	The paper is scientifically robust because it addresses the real life challenges that farmers are facing. It has been addressed with scientifically designed protocols. Well written and explained.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. But the referencing is not consistent. In the reference the year of publication is omitted in some references. Some references are missing in the document and vice versa.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think it is important to put error bars in his graphs. 2. In the tables there is need to do mean separation by putting letters 3. In the tables means and P-value are necessary 4. There is need to refer to the graphs and tables that are in the document. 5. There is no need for discussion and citation in the conclusion 	

Review Form 3

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:	Godwin Mtetwa
Department, University & Country	Lowveld Research Institute, Zimbabwe