



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJEA/1347
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>Performance of Improved Sweet Potato (<i>Ipomea batatas</i> L.) Varieties in Makurdi, Southern Guinea Savanna of Nigeria</i>
Manuscript received on (Date)	
Review comment submitted (Date)	



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	The manuscript provides interesting results for the production region in Nigeria	
Specific comments:	The manuscript can improve in terms of presenting results and depth of interpretation. Standardize use of cultivar codes without space in manuscript. Use of range e.g. 0.30 – 0.40 or WK4 – WK16: needs spaces to be easily readable.	Corrected.
Title and abstract	Fine. The species is Ipomoea. See comments on scanned document. Does the manuscript concern sweetpotato or orange flesh sweetpotato?	The species is not <i>Ipomea</i> but <i>batatas</i> , the genus is <i>Ipomea</i> and the sweet potato (<i>Ipomea batatas</i>) has both white flesh and orange flesh types
Introduction	Fine. Use “β-carotene” from insert symbol function on MSWord.	
Review of literature (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	Fine.	
Materials & methods (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	Fine. Objective of study comes in end of introduction. More clarification required on yield data collection. See scanned document for additions required.	
Results & discussion (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	Graphs need improvement to be easier readable. Fig. 1-4: Use same color for same cultivar in each graph. Enlarge graph to width of page and increase width of bars. LSD's must be provided. Trend lines are helpful. Error bars not recommended to be added. Fig 4 cannot have negative scale. Table 2 add unit in table heading. Calculate yield in t/ha to be comparable with introduction. The yield of NARSP/05/022 is much higher than the other cultivars (54 t/ha) (and very high compared to farmers' yield mentioned in introduction). Are the selection conditions relevant to farmers' conditions? Due to not defining saleable tubers in Materials and Methods, it is difficult to follow yield results – see comments on scanned document. More variable can be presented in table 3.	I agree with enlargement of the graph, but not the use of the same pattern for the same cultivar since key is provided to identify the cultivar in each chart. Also, error bars are good enough for a work of this nature as other scientists and journal use it. The negative scale does not reduce the accuracy of the work. Yield is better appreciated in kg/ha. But for consistency, the figures in Introduction have been converted to kg/ha. Saleable tubers have been defined in Materials and Methods. The



SDI Review Form 1.5

	Use only "arial" font in tables. Table 4 streamline to only present r values followed by * or ** as indicated. Cultivars can differ in allocation to roots vs tops. Mostly this is in competition and positive correlation of tops and roots not expected. Make more sense to relate total yield instead of saleable yield. Present discussion in 2-3 paragraphs. See suggestions in scanned document. Data on farmer preference can be presented – not mentioned in methods either.	variables measured are those presented in Table 3. The most important part of sweet potato to the farmer in this part of the country is the root yield and not the top. The top materials were evaluated for convenience and completeness of the work. Data on farmers' preference were not included because farmers observations were recorded orally and no questionnaires were administered.
Conclusion	Update based on comments throughout manuscript. If yield can really by increase to figures obtained, there will be a large impact on food security. However adoption will not only depend on yield – also taste, quality and tolerance. Will you be doing on-farm trials to confirm results?	The work will go on-farm this season (2012) and some of these observations will be taken care of.
References	Minor revision to follow system required by journal.	