

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.	The manuscript is adequate and technically sound. The manuscript's findings may be useful for the scientific community regarding breeding programmes for developing improved <i>Cola nitida</i> varieties.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, Title is self explanatory and seems to be relevant.	
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.	This section is appropriate but required to improve in order of aims, methodology, results, interpretation of results and their practical utility of study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	All the section of manuscript are appropriate	
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.	Overall, the manuscript is well written. This manuscript will be helpful for further breeding programme.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference section should be checked for the journal's guidelines and see the MS for other comments on this section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Introduction should be written in concise way with factual background, clearly defined problem, brief literature reviews and research gap. ❖ Name of the institution, months and year of experiment must be added in methodology section. ❖ Results section needs to revision with more elaboration. ❖ Discussion part needs to be revised with strong scientific explanation. ❖ Reference section needs revision and check proper citations in text as per journal guideline. 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vijay Kumar
Department, University & Country	Bihar Agricultural University, India