

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_123417</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of planting dates and interval of reproductive pruning on yield and yield attributing characters of Yam bean (<i>Pachyrrhizus erosus</i> L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</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 provides valuable insights into optimizing yam bean yield by examining the effects of planting dates and reproductive pruning intervals. Yam bean, being an underutilized but nutritionally rich crop, has significant potential for enhancing food security, especially in regions like the Konkan. The study's results could directly benefit farmers and agricultural policymakers in similar agro-climatic zones.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title is clear and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, it could be shortened slightly for conciseness while retaining its descriptive nature. A suggestion is: "Effect of Planting Dates and Reproductive Pruning on Yield Attributes of Yam Bean (<i>Pachyrrhizus erosus</i> L.)".</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 and provides a concise summary of the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, it lacks clarity in some parts, particularly in the explanation of statistical findings. It would be beneficial to explicitly state the significance levels or p-values for critical results. Additionally, adding a concluding sentence on the broader applicability of the findings could strengthen the abstract.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is appropriate for an original research article. Each section is well-organized and flows logically. However, some subsections, particularly in the results and discussion, could benefit from more detailed statistical analysis explanations. There is also some repetition of explanations regarding pruning effects, which could be streamlined for readability.</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>The manuscript is scientifically sound and follows a solid experimental design using a factorial randomized block approach. The data analysis is appropriate, but more details on how interactions between factors were interpreted would enhance the discussion. Additionally, referencing more recent and directly relevant studies would provide a stronger scientific foundation. The methodology is clearly presented, though additional details on field conditions (e.g., rainfall data) could improve reproducibility.</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>While the references are generally adequate, many are somewhat outdated, with few from the past five years. The inclusion of more recent studies, particularly on yam bean or closely related crops, would strengthen the manuscript's literature review and contextual relevance. Some key references cited in the text also need to be updated or cross-checked for correctness.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are minor grammatical errors and awkward sentence structures that could benefit from revision. For instance, rephrasing some of the sentences in the "Results" section would make the findings easier to follow for readers. Additionally, simplifying technical terms in a few places could improve accessibility for a broader audience.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

### **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>Oladele Dare Dolapo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Plant and Microbial Biology, Academia Sinica, Taiwan</b>