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| **PART 1: Comments** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript contributes valuable insights into the socio-agronomic dimensions of cassava root rot, a major yet understudied constraint in tropical agriculture. By combining producer typologies, field observations, and local knowledge, it provides a comprehensive overview of how cassava farmers in Côte d'Ivoire perceive and cope with tuber rot. The findings highlight critical gaps in extension services, planting material quality, and local disease management practices. This study not only enriches the scientific understanding of cassava pathology  from a grassroots perspective but also informs policy and intervention strategies aimed at improving cassava resilience and food security in West Africa. | Thank you |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title, *"Typology, Perceptions and Endogenous Control Methods of Cassava Root Rot among Producers in Ivory Coast"*, is generally suitable as it reflects the main components of the study: producer classification, farmers’ understanding, and traditional disease management practices. However, the structure could be refined for better clarity and flow. Specifically, placing "cassava root rot" earlier in the title and using more widely understood terms such as "indigenous" instead of "endogenous" may enhance readability and scientific impact. A suggested alternative could be: **"****Cassava Root Rot in Côte d'Ivoire: Farmer Perceptions, Indigenous Control Methods, and Production Typologies."** This version maintains all key elements while improving clarity and focus. | Updated |
| **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 a reasonably comprehensive overview of the study, including its context, objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusion. However, some improvements are recommended to enhance clarity, academic tone, and logical flow. Specifically:   1. **Clarify the objective** early in the abstract with a direct sentence (e.g., “This study aims to…”). 2. **Condense lengthy or repetitive phrases** to improve readability. 3. **Replace informal or vague expressions** such as “there are no effective control methods” with more precise phrasing like “effective control measures are lacking.” 4. Consider **adding a brief statement of significance or implications**, such as how the findings could inform policy, extension services, or future research.   Additionally, replacing technical or less common terms such as “endogenous” with “indigenous” or “local” may improve accessibility for a broader audience.  Overall, with minor edits, the abstract can effectively communicate the value and scope of the research. | Improved |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, as it accurately presents the context, significance, and objectives of the study on cassava root rot in Côte d'Ivoire. The background information on cassava's socio- economic importance, global and national production data, and the relevance of root rot as a disease affecting cassava production is well-supported by references to previous research (e.g., Msikita et al., 2005; Bandyopadhyay et al., 2006).  The methodology, which includes a survey of cassava growers and field observations to assess cultivation practices and disease management, is scientifically sound. The study also addresses key knowledge gaps by focusing on farmers' perceptions and indigenous control methods, which have been underexplored in previous research. Additionally, the references to cassava diseases such as vascular bacterial blight and root rot are in line with established scientific literature.  However, there are a few areas for potential improvement in clarity, such as ensuring that the terminology is precise (e.g., replacing "endogenous control methods" with "indigenous control methods"). But overall, the scientific premise and approach of the manuscript are correct and well-grounded in the existing body of knowledge. | Noted |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The manuscript provides a sufficient number of references to support its claims, particularly in the context of cassava’s socio-economic importance, disease management, and agricultural practices in Côte d'Ivoire. The references are generally appropriate, and many are from reputable sources like the FAO and peer-reviewed | Recent references have been added |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | journals. The references cover key aspects of cassava cultivation, root rot, and agricultural practices, which strengthens the scientific foundation of the manuscript.  The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient but could be enhanced by including more recent studies and reviews on cassava root rot management, integrated pest management strategies, and socio-economic factors. Including references from the last 3-5 years would improve the manuscript's relevance to current trends in cassava research.  Some **references** are outdated, and the addition of **more recent literature** (post-2019) would strengthen the scientific background. |  |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are opportunities to improve sentence structure, grammar, and clarity. Minor revisions to improve flow, consistency, and precision in word choice would make the article more polished and professional. Additionally, paying attention to punctuation and correcting typographical errors will enhance the overall quality of the manuscript. | Improved |
| **Optional/General** comments | Overall, this manuscript contributes valuable insights into the challenges faced by cassava producers in Côte d'Ivoire, and the recommendations offered could potentially improve both the livelihood of farmers and the productivity of the cassava sector. With some revisions for clarity, consistency, and detail, this paper could make a meaningful impact on the scientific community and agricultural policy. | Noted |
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| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s Feedback** (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 detail)*  In summary, as long as the authors have adhered to ethical principles such as informed consent, participant privacy, and ethical approval for the study, there do not appear to be major ethical concerns in this manuscript. It would be good to explicitly state these points in the methodology and ethical considerations sections of the paper. | Noted |