

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_125394 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of red & purple skinned advance clones suitable for Eastern Indo-Gangetic plains of India |
| Type of the Article | |

Review Form 3

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. | The performance of 6 clones of potato was evaluated (dry matter, nutritional status of the tubers and late blight resistance at field level, the nutritional content), to select suitable advance clones for introduction in All India Coordinated Research Project on Potato. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes, the title of the article is suitable, expressing the essence of the research. | |
| 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 of the article states the purpose of the study, the experimental design and the results obtained, but some discrepancy appears: the years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 are specified in the summary and in the Materials and methods are specified as years of observation 2021-2022 and 2022/2023; unit of measurement for dry matter content is missing. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | The structure of the manuscript respects the sections of a well-written research paper, according to the journal. | |
| 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. | It is not specified how the nutritional components in advance clones were determined. In the table from the Experimental Design & Planting details, appear 7 varieties as control for Crop Year 2022-23, but in all the paper only 5 potato varieties are mentioned as control. In the presented study, the authors compared the results obtained for the same variety of potato, for the culture of 75 and 90 days. I think it was more interesting to compare the tested clones with the control, on the same type of culture. In Conclusions, the authors say: The yield performance of these clones (PS/16-02 and PS/16-17) were significantly superior or at par with the planted control varieties, but the anthocyanin content for PS/16-17 was 7.79 mg/100 gram fresh weight and all the control varieties had under 1 mg/100 gram fresh weight anthocyanin content. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. - | The most recent works cited are from 10 years ago, so the bibliography should be supplemented with more recent studies. The first 3 bibliographic titles do not even specify the year of publication. | |
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Generally, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications with minor errors like: The yield performance of these clones was (not were) significantly superior... | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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: | Daniela Giosanu |
| Department, University & Country | National University of Science and Technology POLITEHNICA Bucharest, Pitești University, Romania |