

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_125426
Title of the Manuscript:	Diversity of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi associated with cocoa ( <i>Theobroma cacao</i> L.) agroforestry systems in Togo
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is significant to the scientific community. This work is relevant since it studied arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi associated with cocoa agroforestry. This work revealed a wide diversity of fungi in cocoa cultivation.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, it is.	
<b>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.</b>	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and complete. But, scientific names should be written in italics.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, they are. The subsection and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
<b>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.</b>	I think the manuscript to be accurate in terms of science. The methodology is quite understandable, with potential for reproducibility, which is important for science. The graphs and images make the results of this study clear.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	Yes, there are current, recente and enough references.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The article's English language quality, in my opinion, is appropriate for scholarly communications that demonstrate a strong scientific linguistic quality. The English language can be improved, though. For these reasons I suggest: 1) submit the manuscript for English grammar review by a professional English language specialist. 2) control and corrections using the grammarly with the Quillbot program, which also suggests simplifications and semantic corrections, see the web page: <a href="https://quillbot.com/grammarcheckrammarchecker?utm_medium=paid_search&amp;utm_source=google&amp;utm_campaign=dsa_developing&amp;campaign_type=search">https://quillbot.com/grammarcheckrammarchecker?utm_medium=paid_search&amp;utm_source=google&amp;utm_campaign=dsa_developing&amp;campaign_type=search</a>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**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>Antonio Francisco de Sousa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>E.E.E.P Dom Walfrido Teixeira Vieira, Brazil</b>