



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_4788
Title of the Manuscript:	PRE-TUBER APPLICATION OF FLURIDONE: EFFECT ON VEGETATIVE GROWTH AND SEED TUBER DORMANCY IN YAM (<i>D. alata</i>)
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

[\(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline\)](http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This paper deals with the PRE-TUBER APPLICATION OF FLURIDONE: EFFECT ON VEGETATIVE GROWTH AND SEED TUBER DORMANCY IN YAM (<i>D. alata</i>). The overall quality of the manuscript is good, but presented data need to be reformulated/completed in order to strengthen the originality and quality of the scientific conclusions.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general it is clearly-expressed and I have only a few comments Line 69 - 40% of the total cost of yam production "has a more recent reference" Line 132 – invitro or <i>invitro</i> Line 129-133 - might go in the discussion or introduction Line 159 – FAA "lack the description of the abbreviation and others also: ABA, FLU" Line -166 – microscope "what is the mark" Line 168 - 171 – "I think it should be in the discussion, not in the methodology"	-More recent reference added - <i>in vitro</i> maintained -the text referred to (in the original manuscript) is best suited where it is. I have done this in a number of articles. -FAA, ABA FLU described. -The lines referred to by the reviewer (168-171) are best suited for M&M in this case. It will constitute distraction if placed in the discussion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 210 - 2.6 Experimental Design “should go to the start of the methodology” Line 242 – Table 1 “place the letters” Line 264 -277 – Table 2 and 3 “lack legend of the table”	-It is common to find Experimental Design (2.6, which is now 2.5) after the method for each experiment is described. Moreover, with the insertions in red, the text should be clearer. - Table1: it is not conversional to place letters when SED is used. It is useful with Duncan Test and where treatments are many. -Table 2 and 3: comments same as for Table 1
--	--	--