



**Paper: “Phénotypage d’un Germoplasme de Variétés Locales et Exotiques de Patate Douce [Ipomoea batatas (L.) Lam] sur la Base des Caractères Quantitatifs: Implications pour l’Amélioration Génétique au Togo”**

**Submitted: 16 August 2024**

**Accepted: 15 January 2025**

**Published: 31 January 2025**

Corresponding Author: Gmakouba Tighankoumi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n3p138

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: A. Séraphin Zanklan  
University of Abomey-Calavi, Cotonou, Benin

Reviewer 2: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is a little bit long. However, it seems to be adequate to explain with clarity the content what the report handles. I did some some corrections in it, and should propose as title "Phénotypage d'un Germoplasme de Variétés Locales et Exotiques de Patate Douce [Ipomoea batatas (L.) Lam.] sur la Base des Caractères Quantitatifs: Implications pour l'Amélioration Génétique au Togo". For English version, the title can be "Phenotyping of a Germplasm Representing Local and Exotic Sweet Potato [Ipomoea batatas (L.) Lam.] Varieties Based on Quantitative Traits: Implications for Genetic Improvement in Togo".

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes. But, some parts (particularly in the objects and methods) are confused. The authors may see how to reformulate their statements, so that the paper and/or abstract should shine with no misunderstanding.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

There are enough grammatical and spelling mistakes. I corrected some of them, with a lot of propositions in the full text. They shall take their time to read the paper properly, and follow the authors' guidelines of ESJ.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes. But, the authors did some mistakes over international scientific rules. For, they spoke all over the report of "tubers" at the place of "tuberos roots". Botanically and in taxonomy, it is spoken regularly of tubers (underground stems), tuberos roots, suckers (drageons in French) like in bananas, bulbs (in onion for example; tuberos basal parts of underground leaves; etc.). The experimental design and statistical methods were well presented. However, the citations were not referenced.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper is enough clear concerning the estimated values. The authors could explain, whether the presented errors of the mean values are standard errors or deviations. The results were rather enough well presented; the discussion too. Nonetheless, the authors could examine thoroughly some tables (which are bad presented, and sometimes not readable). Also, some grammatical and punctuation mistakes were inside.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The "CONCLUSION" was accurate, and showed by its end the importance of the study for further experimentations.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of "REFERENCES" was not comprehensive and appropriate. They did not follow the guidelines of ESJ. Moreover, no clarity was actual in it. The authors shall check again it. The authors shall perform and improve that part of their paper

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

The authors should follow my comments to enhance the quality of their paper. I am thinking, that if they did not a little bit those recommendations, the Editors of ESJ could reject the publication of the report in their kind journal. I have already corrected some of the mistakes directly on the full text that I received yesterday. I hope, they could help the authors to improving their paper.

-----