



## SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_44315
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Growth Parameters and Yield Parameters of Three Cultivars of Potato Grown In Hamelmalo, Eritrea
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>)

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete the introductory part from the abstract from line No.6-13. Add treatments and design of experiment. The design mentioned in abstract and methods and material is not matching.</li> <li>Language is not proper as reflects in sentences: line 25 potato is nutritionally enhanced vegetable, line 48: in of the researches</li> <li>no need to divide the introduction in sections(different sub headings may be deleted). line No.55-62 may be deleted.</li> </ol> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sub-section 2.2 (line no. 76-83) may be deleted, design as mentioned is FRBD.</li> <li>What is about the results of other factor and interaction?</li> <li>potash is an important nutrient for potato, it was not applied?</li> </ol> <p><b>Results and discussion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very less difference in growth parameters at 30 and 60 DAP?</li> <li>There is no need to mention correlation coefficient value between same traits i.e. 1 in table 2. What are the .000 values in Table 2, clarify.</li> </ol> <p>9. Conclusion needs to be rewritten.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	There is a need to improve the language,	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In the experiment it is supposed that proper plant population is maintained as it affects the performance of individual plants as well as at per unit area because of availability of space and inputs like nutrients. Similarly proper care of crop is also required for evaluation of varieties. The differences observed may be due to lack of plant protection measures which could have been avoided to evaluate the actual genetic potential of the varieties.	

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>Table 1 and Figure1 require prior permission</p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. S. Kushwah
Department, University & Country	College of Horticulture, Rajmata Vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, India