



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_16496
Title of the Manuscript:	SCREENING OF GUINEA WHITE YAM (<i>Dioscorea rotundata</i> , Poir) ACCESSIONS AT THE LAST STAGE OF UNIFORM YIELD TRIAL IN ITU RIVER BASIN, AKWA IBOM STATE, SOUTHEASTEN NIGERIA.
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 (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	Text should be written as the Journal instructions suggest. It refers, primarily, to the numbering of references and their presenting in the text by the appropriate number, rather than the author's last name and the year of publishing.	This instruction has been fully complied.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	All the suggested revisions by this reviewer are given as comments in the article. They are mainly related to some stylistic changes in the text. <u>Line 1:</u> No comma after <i>rotundata</i> and period after Poir - (<i>Dioscorea rotundata</i> Poir.) <u>Lines 2-4:</u> The title seems to be quite long, presenting almost the half of the Materials and Methods. The author(s) could consider making it shorter. The aim of the work is "hiding" the title, and something like "Evaluation of Guinea White Yam (<i>Dioscorea rotundata</i> Poir.) for Yield and Yield Components in Nigeria" or something like that is recommended. The reason of the change suggested is not only the length of the title, but also the fact that the title does not reflect the main theme of the study that is the yield and the yield components. The detailed description, like the time and the exact place of the experiment, is going to be given in the Materials and Methods. <u>Lines 22-23:</u> Key words are to be not more than two per term. They should be arranged according to the broadness and/or the importance. For example:	Line 1 Comma has been deleted after <i>rotundata</i> and period inserted after Poir. Line 2-4 The title has been modified to read. Evaluation of Guinea White Yam (<i>Dioscorea rotundata</i> Poir.) for yield and yield components in Nigeria.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Yam, white yam, yield, yield components, <i>Dioscorea rotundata</i>, Nigeria. The keywords revision is strongly suggested. Line 26: (<i>Dioscorea rotundata</i> Poir.) instead of (<i>Dioscorea rotundata</i>) Lines 26-27: Actually, the references should be placed at the beginning or at the end of the sentence. Placing the reference within the sentence breaks the flow of the sentence and reduces its clarity. Moving this reference to the end of the sentence is proposed. Line 41: The same suggestion as previous. Line 77: The same suggestion, as in similar previous cases. Maybe, to split the sentence in two: The yam setts of 76 each genotype were placed separately into each of the baskets and watered daily for initiation of 77 sprouts (Ezulike et al., 2006; Timothy and Bassey, 2009). Sprouts occurred within three weeks after78 nursery planting. Line 142: Maybe, it would be a good idea to start the sentence with “Dirby” reference”Studies of Dirby et al. (2011) have shown that <i>Dioscorea rotundata</i> sheds over 90% of its leaves 141 at full tuber 142 maturity which may indicate physiological maturity of the plant and readiness for 143 harvesting (Awoniyi and Omomona, 2007).” Line 156: Since the author(s) is discussing some traits as phenotypic yield markers, indicating positive associations between them and the yield, maybe it would be a good idea to present some correlation results, to quantify and support their observations.	The previous key words have been replaced with the suggested key words. Line 26 The correction has been effected. Line 26-27 The references have been placed as directed. -do- The correction has been affected. The suggestion has been adhered. Correlation was not conducted, please.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is written at the minimum, presumably due to a limited number of pages. With the certain introductory text reduction (Introduction or/and Materials and Methods), maybe the space obtained would be just enough to present some more of statistics like correlations, especially cause the Author(s) indicates several times the individual components of yield as potential phenotypic yield markers. That could be of great help for the selection in early generations in a breeding process. Parameters of variation (Coefficient of Variation, Standard Deviation, Variance) are kind of lacking. Having at least one of them could give some insight into population homogeneity (variation). An old good custom of presenting the descriptive statistical results, as well, is to give mean values jointly with standard error ($\bar{x} \pm s_e$), just to show the confidence level (the preciseness of the measuring). The general impression is that the rich trial delivered the data that could have been analyzed in more details by AMMI, cluster, path analysis etc. Perhaps, that kind of work has been done, but it is not visible in this presentation of the results.	
---	--	--