



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	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	quoting a paper.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The REFERENCES need to be homogenized for their format. See Agbo line 278 for ex.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper presents valuable information and could be published after major revision.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer