



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 author to indicate whether fresh roots weight or fresh vine weight in the text to avoid confusion with dry weight If the was dry matter content of the sweet potato varieties were tested then it should be included If farmers were involved their data /and or their views should be incorporated It should be clear in the text that what the author tested was sweet potato and not potato these are two different crops The author should use one font style for the paper instead of mixing The author to qualify on the improved varieties are they selection from land race / introductions or breeding lines?	Dry matter was not tested and only fresh root,fresh vine(fodder) were tested and this indicated in the Materials and Methods .Farmers were involved in the harvesting and palatability test.The title clearly indicates that it was sweet potato (<i>Ipomea batatas</i>) that was tested and not potato (<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>).The objective of the work indicates that these improved varieties were introductions..
Specific comments:	Change tuber to roots in all the text as technically the sweet potato are developed roots underground and not tubers while (tubers are swollen stems developed underground)	Corrected, but in popular usage, tuber is acceptable for sweet potato to distinguish it from the feeder roots, which do not swell.
Title and abstract	Title is ok Abstract need to bring out the constrain that led to the study ,highlight the lowest achievable yields by the farmers as compared to the authors results this may give a clear picture of the abstract. The sweet potato eaten are roots and not tubers I suggest this should be changed in the whole text	The constraints that led to the study are adequately highlighted in the section of Introduction and I think it is ok.
Introduction	Line 31 eaten as potato crisps change to eaten as sweet potato crisps in most parts of Nigeria Line 34 and minced dried shrimps (Wong, 2007; Tewe et al., 2003) use the same font style one is calibri while the other is verdana.	Corrected as the entire manuscript is now in Arial and font sizes are as prescribed by journal.
Review of literature (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)		
Materials & methods (Heading may differ in the	Line 47 50'E, elevation 98 m]change to 98 metres above sea level (masl)	Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.5

case of review paper)		
Results & discussion (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	Line 88 Year x treatment interactions were not significant, so data for both years were pooled together and Line 89 analyzed. The data generated were analyzed using the SAS, 2000, Statistical. Use one font style the highlighted are different with other body text Figure 1 and 2 are not clear and are congested unless one uses a coloured screen it does not come out clearly probably use other options. If possible give the scale on all the axis like in figure 3 and 4 are better I suggest that Table 2 incorporate the units inside the table eg vine length(cm), vine girth(cm), also Fodder Weight should be fresh fodder weight Line 147 Makurdi (Table 3). Tuber diameter varied from 0.00-8.23 cm. NARSP/05/022 gave the highest significant tuber Line 148 diameter (8.23 cm). CIP 440037, which had no tuber, along with NASPOT 2 had the lowest tuber diameter change to read Line 147 Makurdi (Table 3). Tuber diameter varied from 0.00-8.23 cm. NARSP/05/022 gave the highest significant root diameter (8.23 cm)., along with NASPOT 2 had the lowest tuber diameter while CIP 440037, which had no root I suggest that Table 2 incorporate the units inside the table eg , Tuber Diameter (cm), Tuber length (cm), weight. (kg / ha) also add fresh root weight Line 186 fresh fodder weight fodder weight=Fodder) check and correct appropriately Line 194 number of leaves per plant and vine length) over time as observed in this study were to be expected delete to be Line 195 Morphologic al should be one word correct Line 199 (NARSP/05/022 and TIS 87/0087)) and the decline just before tuber maturation (, NASPOT 2 and NASPOT 4) agreed delete the Line 214 gave far less saleable tuber yield than NARSP/05/022,	Corrected. Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Please, the title of Table 4 has already been defined that Fodder = fresh fodder weight. This was done to conserve space in the Table and this is acceptable as standard practice in many quarters. Corrected Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.5

	NARSP/05/007C and TIS 87/0087, farmers preferred it to Line 215 these varieties (where did the author involved the farmers that they preferred these varieties. In the work there is no mention of farmers' participation. The author may need to verify this statement)	Farmers were involved at the harvesting stage and were involved in the cooking and "palatability" test, but only oral interview was conducted on the ten farmers used.
Conclusion	ok	
References	ok	