

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122558
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological evaluation of locally available cultivated taro (<i>Colocasia esculenta</i>) cultivars of Kokrajhar district for growth and yield attributes
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The article 'Morphological evaluation of locally available cultivated taro (<i>Colocasia esculenta</i>) cultivars of Kokrajhar district for growth and yield attributes' is a topic of major importance because it enables local agrobiodiversity to be characterised. The article is original insofar as it allows us to understand and preserve local agrobiodiversity adapted to local conditions, which can improve yields and crop resilience in the face of climate change.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is acceptable</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>In the abstract, the aims are too detailed, containing both the objectives and a lengthy context. The author should break down this part (aims) into context and aims.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure used for writing the article is standard. However, in terms of methodology, the characteristics used must be standard parameters used in the characterisation of Taro cultivars. The author is asked to consult the IPGRI databases to identify and code the parameters chosen. It is not a question of new analyses, but of referencing the parameters chosen so that they conform to the standard in the description of Taro.</p>	
<p>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>	<p>Plant spread, plant height, number of side shoots, petiole length and leaf size are among the parameters chosen by the author to discriminate taro cultivars from an agronomic point of view. There are other parameters that the author could have included if the IPGRI database had been consulted. However, the parameters chosen make it possible to identify differences between cultivars and constitute a first step in characterisation. Statistical analyses are used to assess the degree of significance between the selected parameters. This is a step forward, as it shows that the cultivars are agronomically different. The author must insert some photo of the cultivar studied.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The majority of references are old. More discussion is needed. The bibliographic reference section needs to be revised. The references are not listed alphabetically. The number of pages is also missing.</p> <p>The author must read https://academicjournals.org/journal/AJAR/article-full-text-pdf/DD4641056919.pdf to improve his redaction.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the level of English is acceptable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The introduction lacks a problem statement.</p> <p>In the methodology, references should be provided to explain the choice of these parameters.</p> <p>In the results section, the author talks about five varieties instead of four. The discussion needs to be reviewed and improved.</p> <p>The pdf link attached to the commentary should be read and information can be drawn from it.</p> <p>This article, once the corrections have been incorporated, provides a solid basis for geneticists and breeders to create new varieties.</p>	

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:	Kodjovi Mawuegnigan Leonard Agbodan
Department, University & Country	University of Lomé, Togo