



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_28260
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenotypic Variation Analysis of Sweetpotato Germplasm Resources from Different Agro-climate Zones
Type of the Article	Short 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	It is good Short research article with lot of accessions examined. Corrections are required. - Improve English in manuscript (to long sentences, bad sentence construction, typographic errors) - The number of ramets, replications and ramets per accession is not concise in 2.2 Experimental design and 2.3 Sampling and traits measurement. Please clarify - Time of analyses and phase of plant development wasn't precisely explained in Mat. and Met. chapter - lines 83-84 Avoid retelling or rewording of tables. It is general comment for all text since it burdens the text of manuscript	-Response: Accepted. I have checked the manuscript thoroughly to improve the English, the changes made to the text are in yellow. -Response: Accepted. 2.2 experimental design was changed into "The varieties were evaluated in a randomized complete-block design with three replications, a distance of 1 m was maintained between the plots. Each accession was represented on the row with 10 ramets, plant to plant distance was 25 cm. Row to row spacing was 75 cm and the row length was 2.5 m for each accession. All the varieties were grown under normal agronomic practices." 2.3 experimental design was changed into "The morphological traits were recorded on five individual ramets in one replication after 60 days of planting. Yield survey was done with three replications during harvest. Samples were collected and submitted to the Hubei Engineering and Technology Research Center of Sweetpotato at Wuhan for dry matter content (%) measuring". -Response: Accepted. The morphological traits investigation was done 60 days after planting. Yield survey was performed during the harvest and samples of sweetpotato of each accession were collected for dry matter content measuring after the harvest, they were



SDI Review Form 1.6

		illustrated in the text and colored in yellow. -Response: Accepted. The retelling part of the table was deleted. It was refined like this “The mean expression of the two agronomic traits, yield and dry matter content recorded on varieties were presented in Table 3. Data with regard to dry matter content and yield revealed significant differences among the varieties, the coefficient of variance was 13.98% and 54.74%, respectively.”
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- line 72. Avoid starting of sentence with number - lines 72, 82, 88 There is no need for brackets around word Table - lines 75-78 You don't need to list “other traits” - It should be stated somewhere that one year results are part of longer field research (two or three years) as it is usual for agricultural research	-Response: Accepted. It was started with “The frequency distribution showed that” before the number 75%. -Response: Accepted. They were revised in the lines. -Response: Accepted. The list of other traits was deleted. -Response: Accepted. The statement was added to the end of the discussion chapter, it was revised like this “This study lacked multiple zones to eliminate the bias because of financial problem and the results were part of longer field research,”.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- Numbers of correlation coefficients which are statistically significant on both levels (1% and 5%) are in my opinion to low (about 0.25 or 0.2 respectively). Check calculation - My opinion is that in References all authors should be listed (lines 191, 194 and 205)	-Response: This results were automatically generated by software SPSS, I think the reason why correlation coefficients (about 0.25 or 0.2 respectively) were classified to be statistically significant is that the software evaluated them from the general level. -Response: Accepted. All authors were listed in the references. Thank you very much. I greatly appreciate your concerning improvement to this paper.