

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Participatory Varietal Selection and Agronomic Evaluation of African Eggplant and Roselle Varieties in Mali	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 75-08-2017	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title is clear and indicates the scope of the paper</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The abstract lacks a clear objective statement. Methods and results are presented clearly. The key words are not very helpful</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>The article has some grammatical errors but it is quite understandable</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Explanation for variety rankings and scores is not clear. See comments to the authors</i>	

<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>See comments to authors below</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Insufficient trials were conducted to draw any major or significant conclusions</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>I do not know well the roselle and African eggplant literature but suggest the authors include this paper: African Nightshades and African Eggplants: Taxonomy, Crop Management, Utilization, and Phytonutrients. <a href="#">Ray-Yu Yang</a> <sup>*1</sup>, <a href="#">Chris Ojiewo</a> <sup>2</sup></i></p> <p><sup>1</sup> Nutritionist, AVRDC-The World Vegetable Center, Tainan, Taiwan, ROC  <sup>2</sup> Vegetable Breeder, AVRDC-The World Vegetable Center, Regional Center for Africa, Arusha, Tanzania  <a href="#">African Natural Plant Products Volume II: Discoveries and Challenges in Chemistry, Health, and Nutrition</a>  Chapter 11, pp 137–165  <b>Chapter DOI:</b> 10.1021/bk-2013-1127.ch011  <b>ACS Symposium Series</b>, Vol. 1127  <b>ISBN13:</b> 9780841228047 <b>eISBN:</b> 9780841228054  Publication Date (Web): October 4, 2013  <b>Copyright © 2013 American Chemical Society</b></p>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The Introduction states that farmers are slow to adopt new varieties but the authors provide no explanation for this. Is this due to lack of farmer awareness, release of inappropriate varieties, lack of seed availability, or other reasons?

The Introduction needs a clear objective.

The authors state that they used a participatory selection process to increase awareness. Twenty-two farmers from

the Bamako area participated in the selection process but did this participation actually lead to significantly increased farmer awareness beyond the 22? It is not clear why 22 participants were selected (not 100, 50 or 10) and the criteria to select these participants besides that they were farmers and traders. If a different group of farmer/traders were selected or if the trial was done in a different part of Mali or done in a different year, would the outcome be the same? As the authors say in the conclusion it would be better to include separate groups of farmers and traders and compare their evaluations. **The major weakness of this study is that it was done in only one year and location and involving few farmers. The study should be repeated a second year and preferable in different locations.**

It would have been interesting to test and compare several methods of participatory farmer selection and measured increases in farmer awareness. As it is, the article reports a routine variety trial that is mostly of local interest.

It is not clear how the scores for different traits and total score in Tables 4, 6 and 8 were calculated. Were individual traits weighted according to relative importance and how were these combined to achieve the total score?

Some tables could be combined for easier reading: Table 1 and 3; Table 2 and 5.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

The article in its present form is a routine variety trial and the results are only of local interest. It lacks research questions that would make it interesting to a broader readership.

The work was done by the senior author when he was an AVRDC breeder. The byline should say AVRDC breeder but indicate his current position.

