



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_31649
Title of the Manuscript:	Dry Matter Accumulation, Nutrient Uptake and Nutrient Use Efficiency of Two Improved Cultivars of Taro (Colocasia Esculenta) Under Screen House Conditions in Samoa
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	The paper addresses the issue of nutrient use efficiency in Taro, which is an important staple food crop in South Pacific nations. The paper is properly written, making it easy to understand. The following are aspects needing improvement: 1. The problem underlying the research is not clearly explained. The importance/rationale of conducting this research in the context of Samoa is not clearly explained. 2. Furthermore the reasons underlying the choice of the two cultivars are not explicit . Here we need to know the criteria which were based on to select samoa 1 and samo 2 3. The study context should be thoroughly described (location, environment, farming system, climate, major population characteristics). 4. For better understanding the context, I suggest authors provide the initial nutrient composition of the soil used during the trial 5. What is the rationale of measuring nutrient accumulation in different plant parts.? The whole objective of assessing nutrient use efficiency is to look at the accumulation of nutrients in harvestable plant parts, assessing how plants are effectively utilising soil nutrients in harvestable plant parts. 6. Data in Table 3 should be statically analysed, for instance, I would advise for a T-test assessing differences between both cultivars in nutrient update. 7. R2 reported on graphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be written	1. The problem statement has been included together with the objective at the end of the introduction section. 2. Information also included in the last paragraph of the introduction section. 3. Included at the beginning of the methodology under sub-heading "Study area". 4. Included in Table 1 under sub-heading " soil chemical characterisation. 5. Included in the secod paragraph of the "Introduction" section . 6. This table now reads as "Table 4" and included are the P values and LSD's from the t-test. 7. Changes made on the graphs. 8. This table now reads as "Table 5" and included are the P values and LSD's



SDI Review Form 1.6

	with two decimals. 8. Data in the table 4 should also be analysed statistically analysed to detect differences 9. For Table 2, I would suggest authors present means of dry matter and nutrient update with the summary for Anova analysis (indication of LSD or SED values), below. 10. The same should be done for Table 4. Here readers want to know the average plant nutrient update as well as variation between cultivars and in time 11. The conclusion section does not reflect the context of the paper. I suggest authors re-work again on the context of the paper and what is the rationale. The identification of nutrient limiting Taro production and the extent to which specific nutrient deficiency can affect Taro production should be key elements in the introduction and these should emphasised on in the conclusion as well 12. One of the weakest points of the paper is that it does not show the implication of the results of the study and how the results will be be used to improve Taro production in the area. 13. The discussion section is weak and especially the section about nutrient update in different plant part (corms, leaves) is not clearly integrated into the paper. 14. The conclusions and recommendations of the paper are not clear. The reader needs to understand the implications of the results for the future development of the crop in the region? 15. The authors have mostly used outdated resources. I think the authors should revisit existing updated literature , try and enrich the paper with discussion using more recent literature on Taro.	from two way Anova analysis. 9. The means and summary presented now as Table 3. 10. Same as 8 above. 11. The conclusion has been revised to include this. 12. This has been included in the discussion as well as conclusion sections. 13. Improved on. A separate section on discussion has been included. 14. This has been extensively revised,. 15. Appropriate literature search with updated referencing have been carried out.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		Followed as highlighted in the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is good and provides important information that may be useful for future development of Taro, a staple food in the region. But some improvements are needed before the paper can be published. More specifically, the rationale for the study is not explicit. Some detailed information are needed to understand the context of the study (methodology). Finally, the implications for the study should be clearly highlighted, that in line with key results obtained from the study.	