

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_122562</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Performance of papaya varieties grown under open and polyhouse conditions in Kerala</b>
Type of the Article	

## 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>
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 quintessence of the article is based on the comparative aspect of the productivity of papaya in cultivation outside and in polyhouse. This is not always common and requires a lot of diligence on the part of researchers. Thus, having the information relating to such a study contributes to better understanding of the alternatives that open up in the search for better plant productivity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article can be reformulated in a better way, here is a suggestion: "Comparative study of the agronomic and organoleptic performances of some varieties of papaya ( <i>Carica papaya</i> L.) grown outdoors and in polyhouse in Kerala (India)"	
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 article abstract is incomplete. Authors do not need to specify the title of the article in the abstract. I suggest this withdrawal. I recommend that authors add certain points such as: - the objective of the study; - a brief description of the experimental setup used and specify the method used for the phytochemical analyses;	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the article is not appropriate for a good understanding and appreciation. The subsections are not specified separately at all. In particular, those devoted to the "Materials and methods" and "Results and discussion" sections. The subsections devoted to: 2.1 do not appear. Presentation of the study site; 2.2. Plant material; ...; 2... Statistical analyses, to cite just these examples. Therefore, I strongly recommend that authors refer to the journal's authors' guides as well as to some model articles already published in 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.	From a scientific point of view, this manuscript, through the results obtained, has the elements that can make it robust and technically sound. However, its structuring and writing truly called into question its scientific solidity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are insufficient. Indeed, there are almost no references cited in the section required in the introduction. Except, only one which, moreover, has not been referenced in the section devoted to bibliographical references. Authors must change their minds about this extremely important detail if the article is to be scientifically robust and technically sound and therefore of publication quality.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of language can be improved for scholarly communication. However, compared to the major shortcomings noted, it is understandable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article in its quintessence has good substance. However, the major gaps noted in each section of the article not only hinder the highlighting of the results laboriously obtained by the authors, but also absolutely call into question the considerable advances that govern the writing of scientific articles. For example, the results were subjected to an analysis of variance (ANOVA) and yet no standard deviation or margin of error was assigned to the different means obtained in the results presented. Which, among other things, should absolutely be reviewed by the authors so that the article is scientifically acceptable. Thus, in all objectivity, the article requires in-depth revision on the part of the authors.	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Ramses Tsala</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Ngaoundéré, University of Yaoundé 1, Cameroon</b>