

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_124631
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological diversity of 23 kola (<i>Cola nitida</i>) genotypes from Côte d'Ivoire and Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 manuscript provides an evaluation of diversity in the introduction strains, which is very beneficial for future variety development. Introduction strains have great potential to produce new sources of diversity and novel traits not found in local plants. One point worth noting is that it would be beneficial to compare these with the existing local strains and also conduct a kinship analysis, which could lead to more accurate crossing recommendations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Ya	
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.	Need a slight revision.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Ya	
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.	Statistically, the analysis is well-founded, and I appreciate that. It would be even better if graphs were added. Additionally, representative images should be provided, as this manuscript discusses diversity; perhaps the figures included could reveal unique aspects that warrant further investigation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Better if the author able to add more.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to be improved.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rizki Bagus Nugroho
Department, University & Country	Indonesia