



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_42623
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional status of five sweet potato varieties grown in Bolgatanga Municipality in the Upper East Region (UER) of Ghana.
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

Accepted for publication with minor corrections as suggested below	Author's response to 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 REVISION</u>	Note to the Author by peer reviewer: Red color highlight in the main text of the original document is for author's correction or edition. Yellow color highlights are indicating the the locations where corrections are done by peer reviewer. Title: Nutritional status of five sweet potato varieties grown in Bolgatanga Municipality in the Upper East Region (UER) of Ghana. Revised title: "Sweet potato varietal evaluation trial for food nutritional values" Abstract: 1) Aim: Please remove "To grow five varieties of sweet potato together on the same beds under the same edaphic conditions" 2) Study design: This is not the complete study design, please include design that is appropriate for screening varieties for nutrient trials, as it will be affected by the growing location and soil. Whether it is line sowing, if replicated, randomized the varieties while planting within each line and between lines. 3) Place and duration of the study is missing 4) Methodology is missing 5) Results: Data and results of oils is missing. 1. Introduction 1) The last two sentences in paragraph one was missing references, if it is the same reference that was cited for the statistical data, please ignore the comment. 2) Please remove the subsection for the background information, and there was no other information attached to introduction beyond the statistics of cultivating sweet potato. 3) Please include background information on nutritional trait - varietal evaluations conducted in sweet potato or other minor tuber crop using evaluations done in parallel lines on the same bed. 2. Methodology 1) Fig:4: Please place the Ghana Map below the city and increase the font size to match with rest of the article. 5) In 2.1 section, please revise the last few lines stated about the most common crops grown in the study area. 6) In section 2.2, please state clearly if the vines or vine cuttings or slips used for planting. 7) In 2.3 section, please describe the composition of the organic manure and the source of acquisition. Please fill the blanks with details of transplanting age of vines of sweet potato varieties. 8)In section 2.4, Please specify the details of the harvest, is it after four months of maturity of tuber formation, or four months after transplanting. 9)In section 2.4, Please provide the details of the AOAC analysis protocol adopted in the same section and there is no requirement for another sub head 2.5. Please describe the AOAC methods, variables and samples with quantities taken for measurements using instruments as specified in the standard protocol. 10) Please include a section for statistical analysis., might be 2.5; 11) The reason for using duplicate samples for analysis of biochemicals is missing Results and Discussion:	Please thank you very much for the careful scrutiny of the manuscript. You have spent time to work on it and I am very grateful. Please accept my apology for the avoidable omissions and mistakes. I am sorry. Title: I have no objection to the revised title, though it appears complicated to me. Abstract: 1) Aim: Please thank you for revised aim. Study design: Please thank you. I have made changes. Results: Thanks please. I mean total carbohydrates and fats. Sorry for the misuse of words. Introduction The last two sentences..... Yes please. It is the same reference. 2) Please remove.... Done, please 3) Please include... Done, please MoFA Please, this is a national abbreviation in Ghana that is why I like to maintain as such. 1) Fig:4: Please... Done, please 6) In section..... Done, please 7) In 2.3 section... Please, the organic manure was not analysed for its chemical constituents. Therefore, I described only the preparation and source. 8)In section 2.4,... Please they were harvested four months after transplanting on the same day 9)In section 2.4, 10) Please include.... Please I thought a simple comparison with P values could be done statistically, so when the lab report was ready, I sent it to the Department of Statistics in our school. However, they said the data could not be analysed as it all came from one bed. Analysing five samples in five replicates for nutrient content, concentration of the minerals as well as total carotenoids and beta carotene is too costly to afford. My intention was also to analyse for vitamins and phytochemicals but for reason of cost, the analysis is being serialised. Therefore, the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	1) Table 1: If the data presented in the table are mean comparisons, please include the SD, CV values, to know the critical differences existed among the varieties with statistical significance 2) Table 2: Please know that it is required to present numerical data up to two decimals only. 3) Please avoid the repetitive use of expanded version of variety names when they are coded. Discussion: 1) Please avoid the repetitive use of expanded version of variety names in place of codes when they are coded. 2) 3.4 subsection onwards, please check for repeated terms of variety in place of author's set codes to be consistent throughout the text. 3) Please avoid repetition of results in the discussion or merge both results and discussion sections to avoid repetitive use of the information and data presented. 4) Please include discussion for any observed variation between the varieties used in the present research study compared to those reported in other areas, either phenotypically (textural, structural, morphological) or genotypically (genetic background /parents/genetic source of the variety tested). 5) In the last paragraph of discussion, please include a statement about the soil type, nutrient status of the soils during experimental cultivation period along with the organic manures applied Images: 1) Please align the images/picture labels with respective images References: 1) In the references section, the title of the article is written by using first letter of each word in upper case alphabet. Please follow the corrections made for references 22, 23, 24 etc., to correct the rest. 2) Common space errors identified between year and volume numbers as well as italicization of scientific name 2) Please follow the rules of SDI for thorough error identification and correction, besides the one identified now., before final submission. Strength 1) Introduction has a major discussion covering the production statistics of sweet potato covering various regions of Ghana. 2) Author has a point in conducting the research and compare the values with other regions of the country and the world. This research might help in improving the production of the specific varieties in the areas of their high nutritive values. Major weaknesses 1) Place and duration of the study and methodology were missing in abstract. 2) Author mentioned study design but did not clearly stated about the homogeneity of soil samples of the soil bed chosen., to eliminate the soil heterogeneity factor in screening variety's potential contribution of nutrients from same bed. 3) Lack of information on definition of variables, samples, number of samples collected from each line, number of lines used for sowing the varieties, and the reason for using duplicate samples for analysis of biochemicals is missing 3) Oils term was mentioned in the abstract, but were not described in the methods or presented any related data in results and discussion 4) Repetitive use of data, and results. Minor weaknesses 1) Space errors, sentence construction while comparison with other	next manuscript is on either comparison of growth characteristics or vitamins and phytochemicals. 1) Table 1: ..include the SD, CV values... Please, the SD values have been added. Table 2: Please, I apologise. I have changed values to two decimal places. 3) Please avoid the repetitive... Please thank you. Corrected. 4) Please include.... phenotypically (textural... Please, as I checked, the differences seem to terminology. While some workers use, local varieties, others say cultivars, yet someone talked genotypes but his work was mainly on the genetics. 5) In the last... status of the soils... Please, sorry we did not carry out soil analysis before and after experiment as we did not intend to relate nutrients/chemicals found in sweet potatoes to that in the soil. 1) Please align the images/picture labels... Please I am not sure I understand this comment but have put the labels on the side of the respective images. This, however, uses a lot of space. Therefore, I still leave the original arrangement for your choice.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	reported results. 2) Repeated use of mg/Kg when explaining the results and discussion, please avoid as much as possible.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		