

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53739

Date: September 10 2025

Title: Review of cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) diversity and development in Africa,

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		X		
Techn. Quality		X		
Clarity			X	
Significance		X		

Reviewer Name: Dr Lakhdar Guerine

Date:

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

.....

.....

.....

Detailed Reviewer's Report

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The article reviews cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) diversity and its food, nutritional, and socio-economic importance in Africa. It highlights cassava's central role in food security and rural incomes, while discussing the main biotic (diseases, pests) and abiotic (drought, poor soils) constraints. The study compiles data on agro-morphological and genetic diversity, emphasizing the use of molecular markers for varietal improvement. Advances in breeding and genomics are presented as key drivers for increasing resilience and productivity. The overall aim is to provide research directions for better valorization of cassava as a strategic crop in Africa.

Strengths

- a) Relevant and comprehensive topic covering agronomic, socio-economic, and genetic aspects.
- b) Good use of recent and international scientific literature.
- c) Clear emphasis on major challenges such as diseases and climate change.
- d) Well-structured research perspectives focused on genomics and varietal improvement.

Weaknesses

- 1) The text is lengthy and sometimes repetitive, which dilutes the core message.
- 2) Presentation could be improved with more summary figures or comparative tables.
- 3) Limited original data — it is mainly a bibliographic review.
- 4) Writing style is sometimes heavy; more concise and fluid editing would strengthen the article.

Recommendations:

- 1) Streamline and structure the text: reduce redundancies, shorten lengthy passages, and highlight the core messages more clearly.
- 2) Improve presentation: include synthesis figures (conceptual diagrams, maps) and comparative tables to better summarize constraints, diversity, and breeding programs.
- 3) Clarify research perspectives: specify priority areas (genomics, biotechnology, diversity management, climate adaptation) and propose practical applications for farmers and policymakers.
- 4) Refine language quality: simplify long sentences, improve readability, and ensure smoother scientific English for better international impact.