

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARRB_123309</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Results Of Trial Production Of Hanski 227 Oriental Tobacco Variety In Dak Lak, Vietnam In 2022 - 2023 And 2023-2024 Crop Seasons</b>
Type of the Article	<b>The article's classification would probably be under agronomy or agricultural sciences, with a focus on crop science or tobacco cultivation.</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<p><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></p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it addresses the local adaptation of an important crop variety, Hanski 227, providing data on its yield, quality, and cost efficiency under Vietnam's specific environmental conditions. The research contributes to the broader goals of improving domestic agricultural production and reducing dependency on imports, which has practical implications for both the economy and agricultural sustainability. I appreciate the manuscript for its methodical approach and practical outcomes, as it highlights the potential of localizing Oriental tobacco production in Vietnam. Additionally, the focus on optimizing labor and production costs adds valuable insights for agricultural efficiency.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>It is descriptive but could be more concise and engaging. Suggested Alternative Title: "Performance and Evaluation of Hanski 227 Oriental Tobacco in Dak Lak, Vietnam (2022-2024)"</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive but could be improved for clarity and completeness. Here are some suggestions for enhancement:  <b>Suggestions for Deletion or Refinement:</b> The specific details of the fertilizer formula (50N + 30P2O5 + 80K2O) may be too detailed for the abstract. You might simplify it to "standard fertilization practices" or mention it briefly if it's crucial to the results. The detailed comparison of leaf characteristics between Hanski 227 and Basma 16 could be summarized more succinctly. For example, "Hanski 227's larger leaves and fewer harvests lead to lower labor costs compared to Basma 16."</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript appears to be broadly appropriate, but there are a few areas where improvements could be made to enhance clarity and organization. Here's a detailed evaluation:  <b>Abstract</b> is comprehensive but could be slightly more focused. Suggestions: Ensure it concisely summarizes the main objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. <b>Introduction</b> Provides necessary background and context. Suggestions: Consider adding a brief summary of the problem statement or research question. A more direct connection between the background and the specific goals of the study would strengthen the introduction. <b>Materials and Methods:</b> Detailed and clear about experimental setup. Suggestions: Experimental Design clarify any control groups or comparative studies, and Statistical Methods: Include details on the statistical analysis methods used to interpret the data. <b>Discussion:</b> Analyze the results thoroughly. Compare with other studies, discuss implications, limitations, and suggest future research directions.</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous trial design and thorough evaluation of the Hanski 227 Oriental tobacco variety. The study is grounded in a clear research objective to assess the suitability of Hanski 227 for production in Dak Lak, Vietnam and employs a well-defined experimental setup with appropriate control measures. The detailed description of the materials, methods, and analytical techniques ensures transparency and reproducibility. Additionally, the results are presented with quantitative data on yield, quality metrics, and growth characteristics, which are critical for assessing the viability of the tobacco variety. The use of standardized procedures for evaluating raw material quality and the consideration of economic factors further underscore the manuscript's scientific and practical relevance. Overall, the manuscript provides a comprehensive and methodologically sound approach to evaluating a key agricultural product.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :-</p>	<p>The references provided in the manuscript are relevant and offer a good foundation for the study on Oriental tobacco. However, to enhance the depth and breadth of the literature review, it would be beneficial to include additional recent sources. For instance, including studies published within the last two years on recent advancements in tobacco cultivation techniques, such as soil management and pest control, would offer valuable insights into current methodologies applicable to Oriental tobacco. Comparative studies of different tobacco varieties, especially those introducing new data or methods, would strengthen the analysis of the Hanski 227 variety. Additionally, incorporating recent economic</p>	

**Review Form 3**

	evaluations of tobacco production could provide a comprehensive view of cost factors associated with different varieties. Finally, including recent reviews or meta-analyses on Oriental tobacco or related topics could provide a broader perspective and identify emerging trends in the field.	
Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the manuscript generally meet the requirements for scholarly communication, but there are areas where improvements could enhance clarity and professionalism.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript provides valuable insights into the trial production of the Hanski 227 Oriental tobacco variety in Vietnam, addressing both its potential for local adaptation and its implications for reducing import dependence. The study is well-structured and presents its findings clearly, though the inclusion of more detailed explanations, visual aids, and recent references would enhance the depth of analysis and facilitate better understanding. The practical implications of expanding local tobacco production are significant, but discussing potential challenges and limitations more explicitly could offer a more balanced view. Additionally, a more detailed justification for the chosen experimental parameters, based on prior research, would strengthen the methodological rigor. The overall language quality is good, but some grammatical refinements could improve readability. Expanding the reference list and acknowledging supporting collaborators or institutions could also add value to the manuscript. Overall, the study makes a commendable contribution to the field and provides a solid foundation for future research and practical applications in tobacco production.	

**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>Ashefet Agete Mengste</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hawassa University, Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia</b>