



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 remets, replications and remets 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	
<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	
<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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dejan Sokolović
Department, University & Country	Institute for forage crops, Krusevac, Serbia