



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_27052
Title of the Manuscript:	AN ASSESSMENT OF TARO YIELD AND STABILITY USING AMMI AND GGE BILOT MODELS
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are some mistakes in the text; - In result, page 5 and line 107, "GEI accounted for 9.0%" should be "9.03%..." - There is no any information about harvesting, time and yield measurement. - In results, line 118-119 the sentence "NCe 010 had the highest tuber yield in three out of the four environments while NCe 002 gave the highest yield in the remaining environment" gave wrong information, it must be corrected according to Tablo 3. - It is better to use abbreviation for environments in figure 2, 3 and 4 like figure 1. - Also, some references absent in the text such as Okpul T. (2005). The references must be controlled.	The Reviewer's corrections have been effected, highlighted on the revised manuscript in yellow. The reference issue has been taken care of.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is well written and an important subject was worked. There are some mistakes but after correction of the mistakes it could be published.	