



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_3767
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Effects of Staking and Planting Dates on the Yields of African Yam Bean, <i>Sphenostylis stenocarpa</i> in Nigeria

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>)

- 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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1.Line 118. Presented results do not allow to write: “date of planting significantly affected the grain/tuber yields” – there are not suitable labels in tables 1 and 3. Influence of this factor was not confirmed with analyses of variance.</p> <p>2.Lines 119 – 120. “Highest grain yields were observed when AYB accessions were staked 120 compared to the accessions that were planted non-staked (Table 1)” –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. table 2 - not 1 2. there are not suitable labels in tables 2. Influence of this factor was not confirmed with analyses of variance <p>3.Line 120. “On the other hand” –using this phrase was incorrect. This statement is a repetition of the content from the previous sentence.</p> <p>4.Lines 121 – 124 – This sentence is written very carelessly. In my opinion, TSs 48 is as good as TSs 86. Maybe means from two years of the study for each variant of planting should be added (this concerns dates of planting too).</p> <p>5.Lines 126 – using the phrase “On the other hand” was incorrect.</p> <p>6.Lines 126 – 128 – There are not suitable labels in table 1. Influence of this factor was not confirmed with analyses of variance.</p> <p>7.Lines 128 – 129 – There is no need to write the same in “other words”. It should be written once, but clear and correct .</p> <p>8.Lines 131 – 132 – What statistical test was made to confirm this difference between the years of the study? Even means from particular years were not shown.</p> <p>9.Line 136 – In my opinion TSs 93 should be mentioned too, because it is as good as TSs 84.</p> <p>10.Lines 136 – “differed significantly (P <0.05) from those planted later” – there are not suitable labels in the tables.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>11.Lines 143 – 144 – in my opinion, this information is not clear enough. Maybe these data should be presented in a table. Moreover, the number of pairs of data have not been shown.</p> <p>12.Lines 149 – 150 – This explanation of the influence of staking on the seed yield is not acceptable. Maybe plants supported with stakes had better light conditions and thus produced more carbohydrates and other compounds accumulated in seeds and tubers? Did the author determine such traits as: the number of branches per plants?, the number of pods per branch?, the number of seeds per pod?, the weight of 1000 seeds? Knowledge about these traits could be very useful to explain the results obtained.</p> <p>13.Line 167 – “attributed to reduced pests infestation on the crop” – did you make suitable observations? If so, this should be described in the results section.</p> <p>14.Lines 185 – 191 – This part of discussion explains nothing and should be rewritten.</p> <p>15.Lines 196 – 199 – This part of conclusion exceeds the results obtained in the presented study.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why the studied objects are named “varieties” in tables 1 and 3, whereas “accessions” in tables 2 and 4? 2. What kind of tuber yield mass is presented in tables 3 and 4 (fresh or dry) ? 3. There are some mistakes in table 2. E.g. 340.6 is marked as c whereas 421.9 and 424.3 are marked as d (staking, year 2009). Similar mistakes are in the column “staking” 2010. 4. There is a mistake in the title of table 4. Instead kg must be Mg (tons). Moreover it should be written Mg·ha⁻¹ or kg·ha⁻¹ instead t/ha or kg/ha (tables 1, 2, 3, 4) 5. There is no need to write “grain yield” in each column in tables 1 and 2. It was included in the title. The same concerns the phrase “tuber yield” in tables 3 and 4. 6. The values presented in tables 3 and 4 should be more precise (value to two decimal places after point should be shown). 7. In my opinion, in the whole manuscript a phrase “seed yield” should be used instead “grain yield”, which is suitable for cereals only. 8. Whole references section has been prepared in a manner inconsistent to AJEA guide for authors. Moreover there are some mistakes in this section: Line 235 – year ?? Line 237 – year 1982 whereas in line 238 – year 2011 ?? Line 264 – Greenland – whereas in line 158 is Polhill ?? Line 274 - year 1992 or 1976 ?? Line 274 – Potter whereas in line 73 – Porter? Line 277-279 – lack in text Line 292 – year 2003 or 2004?? 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents interesting results concerning the effects of staking and planting dates on yielding of African Yam Bean in Nigeria. However, it contains some mistakes which must be improved. Moreover, additional statistical tests concerning the influence of the method and date of planting on yields should be added.</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer