

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123535
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF GENETIC DIVERSITY ANALYSIS IN AFRICAN YAM BEAN (<i>Sphenostylis stenocardia</i> Hochst Ex.A.Rich Harms) USING QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This study is interesting and has practical importance for breeding programs considering work with African yam beans. It will be helpful for researchers and scientists. Overall, I like this manuscript, and I think that it can be published after revision. The topic is relevant to Africa and can help improve the lives of the African population by more efficiently growing this plant and choosing better varieties. Also, this information can help to obtain new varieties with better traits.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 needs to be improved in English (many mistakes).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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>The study needs to be improved not only in English but also in some things regarding the Tables:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not clear with superscripts – what do they mean – it is better instead of letters (a, b, c, d...) to give a number of lines of varieties that are in the table 2. It is unclear what the names of the columns in Table 5 are and what the abbreviation is in the first column. <p>I did not find Table 1 and Appendix (Tables 4 and 5) mentioned in the text. The Conclusions must be rewritten. Please add their information on what accessions are the best from your point of view. Throughout all text Latin names must be <i>italic</i>.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The list of References is good. The number and quality of sources are relevant to the study.	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English needs to improve. It looks like the translation was done using an automatic programme, and the biologist needs to correct it to choose more proper words in some places. Also, some mistakes appear in the text.	
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:	Olena Boika
Department, University & Country	Zaporizhzhia National University, Ukraine