



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_20078
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and Yield Components of Sweet Potato (<i>Ipomoea batatas</i> L.) and their Interrelationships with Root Yield
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	The authors should explore more science on the discussion section to be beef up otherwise their very good research	Noted. An attempt was made to improve
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Spelling mistakes and grammar as highlighted on overall comments	This is noted and corrections were effected in the text.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Removing season 2014 on table headings With minor modifications, i think this manuscript is suitable for publication. The manuscript needs a little more attention to detail in the results, especially the discussion section. This manuscript explores on the growth and yield components of sweet potato Ipomea batatas and their interrelationships with root yield. Sixteen sweet potato varieties were used to study the simple and spatial correlations between plant leaf number, vine length, vine weight, plant root numbers, mean root weight and root yield. Very interesting observations came out of this research and i strongly feel that these results should be complemented or supported with science in the discussion section, which is the only weakness of the manuscript. I have listed my comments below: Abstract: The subheading study design should be	This is noted and corrected in the text This is noted The AJEA reporting template suggests that Study



SDI Review Form 1.6

	removed as the design should be under the subheading materials and methods. This is why the design was repeated in these two sections. There is need to appreciate statistics in this section by showing levels of significance using “P” values as well as the values of the +ve and -ve correlations so that the strength is noted. Introduction: Line 22...about 3t/ha? This yield seems to be very low for sweet potato. Is it a national average, irrigated or dry land production? Clarity is needed. Line 31 ... “often related to one to another”, should be “ often related to one another” or “ often related to each other”. Line 33... “Importance are vital” should read “importance is vital” since the reference word is understanding. Materials and methods: This section was done to perfection. Results and discussion: Table 3, line 171 spelling mistake for the word leaves “leaver” replace the r with an s. There is also needs to include the P vales in result description section for this table. Table 4 There is no need to include the “2014 season” in heading of this table since the season was illustrated earlier. NB, This section has results which are well described. The major weakness of this part is failure by the authors to explore on the possible reasons for the different relationships that were observed in the results scientifically. For example it is generally known that of leaves are a source of photosynthetic assimilates and being a source will contribute in	design be incorporated in the abstract. This is noted, as levels of significance were included. However, the p values were presented in detail in section 3 (Results and discussion) of the manuscript. I consider putting them here will amount to repetition. Attempt was made to trace the source, but to avail. Hence this has been expunged from the text. This is noted and correction is effected in the text. This is noted and is corrected in the text. O.K This is noted and is corrected in the text. This is also noted and effected. O.K. This is deleted This is improved
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	channelling these assimilates to the sink which are the tubers that constitute the yield. High number of leaves can translate into more tuber yield? Was this general assumption observed in the results if not what could be the possible reason for that? References: There seem to be lack of consistence in the referencing system being used. Here the authors need to follow one reference system preferably recommended by the journal. For instance: Line 295, the website normally comes at the end with date of retrieval, after citing the authors. Line 301, this citation uses the author date system for the journal yet in other cited journals dates came after the journal tittles or at the end of the citation.	This is noted and corrected in the text. This is noted and corrected in the text.
--	--	---