



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_22446
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield performance, market tuber quality and evaluation of sugar and starch activity of two Ghanaian varieties of sweet potato (<i>Ipomeoa batatas</i> (l) lam) as influenced by chicken manure and inorganic fertilizer
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	See attachment Page 1, Line 1: The sweet potato is a root and not a tuber. Suggestion – replace the word tuber with root – Page 1, Line 2: Rewrite as: (<i>Ipomeoa batatas</i> [L.] Lam) Abstract Page 1, Line 8: Replace the word tuber (when it refers to the sweet potato) with root throughout the manuscript Page 1, Line 18: Pitstorage – correct this with spacing Page 1, Line 20: Plotshad – correct this with spacing Page 1, Line 20: Storagethan – correct this with spacing Introduction Page 1, Lines 7-10: to investigate the responses of the growth, yield and tuber market quality of two varieties of sweet potato (<i>Apomuden</i> and <i>Okumkom</i>) to chicken manure and inorganic mineral fertilizers. Page 2, Lines 34-35: to determine the fertilizer regimes for optimum yield and tuber quality in sweetpotato. Suggestion, authors should write the objectives consistently in abstract and text. Page 2, Line 43: Spell out acronym upon firs use - FAO / UNESCO Page 2, Line 46: Delete (4) Page 2, Line 45-49: Please rephrase sentence, it is long and difficult to read Page 2, Line 50: Delete (2) Page 2, Lines 49-51: The decomposed and dried chicken manure was applied and worked into the soil... the authors	Please, all issues raised have been addressed, see attachment Please all tuber has been changed to root. this correction has been done tuber has been changed to root this correction has been done this correction has been done this correction has been done this correction has been done this correction has been the application rates is based on the rate indicated in the materials and methods (10t/ha –full dose and 5t/ha- for combinations with inorganic fertilizer) this correction has been The methods has been described briefly This correction has been done This correction has been done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	need to describe the application rates Page 2, Lines 55-56: Walkey and Black and Kheldahl methods – Authors should reference these and give a brief description of what was done. Page 2, Lines 56-57: Similarly, authors should reference these methods and briefly describe (Bray’s method and exchangeable cations was determined by flame emission photometry). Authors should break the methods section into paragraphs for easier reading. Page 2, Line 60: and sugar analysis using... appears as though a word is missing here Page 2, Line 61: Novex- Holland – put in parenthesis (brackets) Page 2, Lines 61-62: Additionally, sweet potato roots were randomly selected after three months storage from each of the storage method for similar analysis. The authors need to clearly state the storage methods used, cannot see that yet. Page 2, Line 62-63: The samples were shredded later with a plastic grater and made to pass through a 0.2 mm mesh. Delete plastic grater. Page 2, Lines 63-64: 10.0 g of each sample was placed in a cheese cloth and a few drops of the sap squeeze out and slowly onto... check for grammar. Page 3, Line 66: sample (in Brix) – should be degrees Brix using the symbol Page 3, Line 67-69: For the determination of starch, the refractive indices obtained from the samples were compared to a <u>standard scale</u> to obtain accurate values, that is the percentage mass of the starch was read from a chart corresponding to the value of refractive index... This standard scale needs to be referenced, whose scale? What are the underlying principles of such a scale etc.? Page 3, Line 74 and page 6, Line 124: Why are Tables 1 and 2 appearing so long after they were first mentioned, and the	This correction has been done Plastic grater has been deleted Grammar has been checked this correction has been done this comment has been addressed The soil and manure analysis was part of the experiment in that the samples were collected and analyzed during the experiment. This issue has been addressed This correction has been done Coefficient of variation (CV) has been included in the tables, some of the tables have been deleted (weather data) and others merged (marketable and unmarketable tuber weight for 2011 and 2012), significant differences have also been indicated this correction has been done
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	information in Table 2, was it part of the experiment, why is it under results? Authors should clarify this. Page 4, Lines 82-83: made up of <u>seven organic manure and fertilizer rates and the control</u> (without any amendment) and two sweet potato varieties was assigned to each block... The authors need to clearly state these. Page 5, Line 108: Data Analysis was done using ANOVA and GenStat Release 9.2 (PC/Windows XP) statistical package. Cite GenStat properly. What type of ANOVA was used? Results & Discussion In general, the tables do not carry standard deviations or errors, can they be included? Also, there are no indications of significant differences in these tables. They should be included. Authors should try to condense and join some of the tables, they are so many. Conclusion Page33, line 508: Check spacing – contentfarmers	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		