

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	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	The manuscript addresses a highly relevant issue concerning potato yield improvement, especially in a region like the Indo-Gangetic plains where agriculture is critical. The focus on red-skinned potato clones offers practical value, considering the growing demand for nutritionally superior and disease-resistant varieties. The research is methodologically sound, and the findings provide valuable insights into the potential of these advanced clones for commercialization. However, the manuscript would benefit from a clearer connection between these clones' traits and their practical applications in the region's agricultural economy.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is descriptive and accurately reflects the study's focus on potato yield parameters and specific geographic conditions. It is suitable as is. However, a minor improvement could be: "Evaluation of Tuber Yield and Disease Resistance of Red-Skinned Advanced Potato Clones in Eastern Indo-Gangetic Plains, India" to emphasize the disease resistance aspect mentioned in the results.	
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.	The abstract provides a good overview but could benefit from more specificity regarding the results. I suggest briefly stating the most significant finding (i.e., which clone performed best) in terms of yield and marketability to make the abstract more impactful.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is appropriate. Each section flows logically, from background to methods, results, and discussion. The "Materials and Methods" section is particularly well-detailed, which adds to the manuscript's technical robustness.	
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 manuscript is scientifically sound and provides valuable data for researchers and farmers. The study follows a rigorous experimental design (randomized block design), and the analysis of yield, disease resistance, and dry matter content appears appropriate. However, expanding the discussion on how these results compare with previous studies could strengthen the paper.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited are sufficient and relevant. They include recent sources and cover critical areas of potato research. No additional references are required at this time.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is generally well-written but has some minor grammatical and syntactical issues. A professional proofreading session would improve readability and presentation. For example, the phrase: "Potato is able to provide more nutritious food per unit of land and time even if it is planted under rancorous conditions as compare to other food crops such as maize wheat rice etc." could be revised to: "Potatoes can provide more nutritious food per unit of land and time, even when planted under unfavorable conditions, compared to other staple crops like maize, wheat, and rice."	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript provides essential data that can be of interest to both researchers and policymakers in the agricultural sector. Further discussion on the economic implications of adopting these clones in local farming practices would add depth to the paper.	

Review Form 3

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:	Muhammad Anas
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture, Pakistan