

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126553
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening Taro germplasm for resistance to bacterial blight incited by Xanthomonas axonopodis pv. Dieffenbachiae
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 scientific paper addresses an important issue in taro production by identifying cultivars resistant to bacterial blight caused by <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>dieffenbachiae</i> . Given the economic and agricultural importance of taro, especially in tropical and subtropical regions, the study provides valuable data for breeding programs aimed at disease resistance, which is essential for sustainable production of this crop. The study is commended for its wide coverage of tested accessions under natural conditions, which allows the application of its results in practice. However, some sections, such as statistical analysis, could have been more detailed to improve reproducibility and usefulness to other researchers.	In my opinion, Statistical analysis mentioned in the manuscript is clear enough to support the findings.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable, but it could be made a little shorter and clearer.	Title of the article have been shortened and made clearer.
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 provides comprehensive information about the content of the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and sections of the articles generally comply with the requirements for scientific articles and include such main sections as abstract, introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and conclusion. However, more clarity could be added to the subsections in the Materials and Methods section. For example, add clear subsections for each key aspect of the methodology: Field Assessment, Disease Assessment, and Data Analysis. This will help make the study design more understandable and reproducible.	Field and disease assessment (Per cent disease incidence (PDI), Per cent disease severity (PDS)) are being documented well in the Materials and Methods section.
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.	This manuscript is scientifically valid and technically sound due to its rigorous approach to evaluate resistance of different taro genotypes to bacterial blight. It demonstrates reliable and reproducible data on disease resistance through conducting field trials over two consecutive seasons. The methodology is well structured and includes established metrics such as disease incidence, disease severity, and area under the disease progression curve (AUDPC). The methodology is well-structured and includes established indicators such as disease incidence, disease severity and the area under the disease progression curve (AUDPC). This allows for accurate quantification and comparison of disease progression. In addition, statistical analysis of the results is performed, making the conclusions valid and applicable to further research. Overall, the paper can serve as a significant contribution to cultivar improvement and plant disease management.	
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 relevant for the study of bacterial blight of taro. However, the article cites some literary sources published more than ten years ago. To increase the relevance of the article, there is a request to include more recent studies.	Not much research works are being conducted on bacterial blight of Taro and so references of recent articles published (less than 10 years ago) are not available.
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the language of the article is generally suitable for scientific communication: the text is clear and uses appropriate scientific terminology.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript provides valuable information for understanding bacterial diseases of taro, in particular the variability in resistance of different genotypes to bacterial blight.	

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)	