

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_128497
Title of the Manuscript:	Contribution To The Identification And Pathogenicity Of The Phytopatogenic Bacteria Responsible For Tuberos Rot Of Manioc In The Production Zones Of The Cote D'ivoire
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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is a significant contribution to the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive study on the identification and pathogenicity of bacteria responsible for cassava tuberous root rot in Côte d'Ivoire, a critical agricultural region. 2. By isolating and characterizing bacterial strains, it offers valuable insights into the diversity and distribution of pathogens affecting cassava production. 3. The findings, including the identification of prevalent bacterial species and their pathogenic profiles, are crucial for developing targeted management strategies to mitigate yield losses. 4. This research not only enhances the understanding of cassava root rot but also serves as a foundation for further studies on sustainable agricultural practices and crop protection in cassava-producing regions globally. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The current title is informative and conveys the main focus of the study. However, it is somewhat lengthy and could be made more concise while retaining its essence. A shorter and more direct title may improve readability and impact.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Title- "Identification and Pathogenicity of Bacteria Causing Cassava Root Rot in Côte d'Ivoire Production Zones"</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the study's background, objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. However, there is room for improvement in terms of clarity, structure, and conciseness.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conciseness: The abstract could be more concise by avoiding overly detailed descriptions of methods and results. 2. Clarity: Certain sentences could be rephrased for better readability and flow. 3. Scientific Terminology: Some terms, such as "germinative capacity," might require more context or simpler phrasing for clarity. 4. Impact Statement: The conclusion could emphasize the broader implications of the study for cassava production and disease management. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>To determine if the manuscript is scientifically correct and strong, we can assess it based on several key criteria: the clarity of its objectives, the appropriateness of its methods, the validity of its results, and the significance of its conclusions.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Based on the provided abstract and title, the language quality of the article is adequate for scholarly communication but could benefit from refinement to enhance clarity, conciseness, and professionalism.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wordiness and Redundancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some phrases are overly detailed or repetitive. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>"The general objective was to identify the main bacterial diseases responsible for cassava tuberous root rot in production areas in Côte d'Ivoire. Specifically, to identify pathogenic bacteria and then to assess the pathogenicity of the bacterial strains isolated."</i> ▪ Could be condensed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>"This study aimed to identify pathogenic bacteria causing cassava root rot in Côte d'Ivoire and assess their pathogenicity."</i> 2. Clarity and Readability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some sentences are long and complex, which could hinder readability. Breaking them into shorter, more focused sentences would improve comprehension. ○ Example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>"Tuberous cassava roots were perforated with a punch and inoculated with bacterial inoculum calibrated to an optical density of 0.2 at a wavelength of 600 nm, corresponding to 10⁸."</i> ▪ Could be rephrased as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>"Cassava roots were perforated with a punch and inoculated with a bacterial suspension standardized to OD 0.2 at 600 nm, equivalent to 10⁸ cells."</i> 3. Minor Grammatical Errors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The phrase <i>"Various bacterial species were identified in this study. In addition, these species vary in their germinative capacity."</i> ▪ Suggestion: Use a more precise term than "germinative capacity" if it refers to the ability to cause disease or reproduce. 4. Consistency in Terminology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some terms like <i>"Roualtella planticola"</i> and <i>"Raoutellia ornithinolytica"</i> have inconsistent spellings, which can undermine credibility. Standardizing nomenclature is essential in scholarly work. 5. Professional Tone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Phrases like <i>"Decay-causing bacteria"</i> might be better replaced with more scientific terms like <i>"pathogenic bacteria responsible for rot."</i> 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into cassava root rot and its bacterial pathogens, making it a significant contribution to agricultural science. Addressing the identified weaknesses would greatly enhance its scientific quality, readability, and practical impact.</p>	

[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:	Balwant Singh
Department, University & Country	Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Avadh University, India