



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10379
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Growth Analysis and Acclimatization of Tissue Culture Derived Cocoyam [Xanthosoma sagittifolium (L) Schott] plantlets
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	Add abit of methodology in the abstract especially when comparing the external leaf structure of tissue Culture-derived and conventionally-propagated Cocoyam. How the cocoyam is conventionally propagated? You need to bring out that. You need to show how in vitro derived cocoyam plantlets have not been successfully transferred from in vitro culture to field conditions (from the literature) hence the need to determine effective acclimatization protocol. Otherwise, as it is now, the knowledge gap you want to fill is confusing.	Done Culture-derived and conventionally-propagated Cocoyam. Conventional propagation is a general well defined method. There is no need to explain basics in a scientific paper. The comparison between conventional and tissue culture derived plantlets and between acclimatized and not acclimatized are good enough to fill that gap and remove any confusion.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript is ok.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		