

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_122625
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield gap analysis of Colocassia in Arunachal Pradesh
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 manuscript is difficult to follow, and the information presented is unclear. There is a disconnect between the text and the data, as some of the data mentioned in the manuscript is not included in the tables. This lack of clarity makes it hard to understand the research findings, which reduces the value of the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title may not fully align with the content of the article, especially given the discrepancies between the abstract and the main paper. I suggest revising the title to better reflect the actual focus and findings of the study.	
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 mentions a different study in the first line, which creates confusion and does not accurately represent the research presented in the main paper. Additionally, the data referenced in the abstract does not match the data in the body of the article. I recommend revising the abstract to ensure consistency with the main content, accurately summarizing the study's objectives, methods, and findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No	
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.	The manuscript has several issues that undermine its scientific robustness. The discrepancies between the data presented in the text and what is provided in the tables raise concerns about the accuracy and reliability of the findings. Additionally, the lack of clarity in the study's objectives and conclusions further detracts from its scientific validity. Therefore, the manuscript is not currently scientifically sound and requires major corrections to meet the necessary standards	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The referencing style should be corrected and also reviewed	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pompi Dutta
Department, University & Country	Assam Agricultural University, India