



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_5827
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on Some Important Consumer and Processing Traits for Breeding Sweetpotato for Varied End-Uses.
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The INTRODUCTION is too long and should be reduced in order to present rapidly the aim of the study. There is a problem throughout the manuscript with the terms BREEDING LINES. Usually this terminology refers to hybrids resulting from crosses conducted locally which are being screened, characterized and evaluated. But in this particular case, it is obvious that some of the so called "breeding lines" are in fact "introduced varieties" which are being compared to locally produced hybrids. Please clarify and add a column in table 2 indicating the "Origin" of each accession being evaluated in the present work Where is Centennial from? Are CIP nos from CIP, Peru? Where is TIS from ? and Shaba?.... etc. Line 15, add Nigeria Line 17...."with varied were evaluated...." ...?? Line 74... onwards ...RCB with how many plants per plot? Spacing between plants within plots? Three reps of how many plants each? Please detail the carotenoids analysis rather than just	• The introduction has been reviewed, though I think the size is adequate. Many other reviewers prefer background information about the status of the crop globally and in the country where the trial was undertaken. • BREEDING LINES: I used the terminology breeding lines with the conviction that materials that were derived by sexual crossing, irrespective of the location, and are being evaluated for release as new varieties could also be called breeding lines. The CIP lines were developed at CIP and sent to our breeding program as part of a collaborative effort towards releasing them in Nigeria. In the list of genotypes sent to us, they were called breeding lines. • CIP Nos were from CIP, Kenya. I will not be surprised if they actually originated from Peru, the global headquarter. TIS was from IITA. • Nigeria had been added to Line 15; • Line 17: "with varied" had been deleted. • Adequate field information had been supplied in the material and method session as demanded.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	quoting a paper.	Detailed carotenoid analysis as documented for harvestPlus by the author has been provided.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The REFERENCES need to be homogenized for their format. See Agbo line 278 for ex.	REFERENCES: - Correct format of using numbers had been followed; - The location of the dates in the current reference format had been followed; - The website where the journal on line 298 can be found had been deleted.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper presents valuable information and could be published after major revision.	