

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research opportunities: Studying AMF diversity informs mycorrhizal ecology. 2. Baseline data: Establishing AMF diversity in Togo provides a reference point. 3. Expands knowledge on AMF diversity in cocoa agroforestry systems. 4. Provides insights into AMF-cocoa interactions and symbiosis. 5. Contributes to understanding of mycorrhizal networks in tropical ecosystems. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	This Abstract has accept with minor revision required (work acceptable but revisions are required), but some important points have to be clarified or fixed before we can proceed and a positive action can be taken.	
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.	<p>*Scientific Contribution*:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Filled knowledge gaps on AMF diversity in cocoa agroforestry systems in Togo. 2. Provided insights into the potential applications of AMF in sustainable cocoa production. 3. Contributed to the development of evidence-based practices for agroforestry management. <p>Overall, the manuscript demonstrates a strong scientific foundation, rigorous methodology, and thoughtful interpretation of results, making it a valuable contribution to the field of mycorrhizal ecology and agroforestry.</p> <p>To further enhance the manuscript, consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Including additional molecular markers for AMF identification. 2. Conducting more comprehensive statistical analyses (e.g., machine learning). 3. Discussing implications for cocoa breeding programs. 4. Providing recommendations for AMF-based inoculants 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Some sentences are overly long and convoluted, making them difficult to follow.2. The writing could benefit from more precise and concise language.3. Technical terms are not consistently defined, potentially confusing non-expert readers4. Sentence structure is sometimes awkward or unclear5. Edit the manuscript for clarity, conciseness, and grammar.6. Use a consistent writing style and Using language-checking software (e.g., Grammarly).	
Optional/General comments	<p>I received and reviewed a manuscript titled: Diversity of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi associated with cocoa (Theobroma cacao L.) agroforestry systems in Togo .</p> <p>This Abstract has accept with minor revision required (work acceptable but revisions are required), but some important points have to be clarified or fixed before we can proceed and a positive action can be taken. The abstract needs to be add first sentence rewrite with title. The authors need to think about what they are trying to say in initial experiment and result more clearly to construct and concise.</p> <p>This manuscript has good work</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:	Prakash Pralhad Sarwade
Department, University & Country	Shikshan Maharshi Guruvarya R. G. Shinde Mahavidyalaya, India