



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_27053
Title of the Manuscript:	VARIABILITY AND INTER-RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN YIELD AND ASSOCIATED TRAITS IN TARO (Colocasia esculenta (L.) Schott.)
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 (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	Introduction Line 31: due to the incidence of the taro leaf blight Line 32 -33: Its flour is considered good for baby food because it is easily digestible, helps with digestible..... Line 36: germplasm through selection. Line 46: effective means to determine the contributions..... Line 49: effects of different components on yield is of prime importance.... Materials and Methods Line 58: The experiments were....(Please how many experiments were run? List them. Are you confusing experiment with trials?) Line 68: as a derived savanna, with a tropical moist forest biozone or ecozone? General comments:	We have affected the correction pointed out by the reviewer but it is important to note that we are grateful to this reviewer for his comments but it is important to note that: we analysed this experiment location by location and not the way he stated and therefore his comments does not apply to us.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line: 58 – 70. Please, rearrange the write-up in this section such that issues on soil attributes of the experimental sites are dealt with before say weather issues or vegetation depending on how you may approach it. As it stands, they are mixed up. Line 85: WAP (at its first appearance define it) Line 87-99: determinations of VG and VP were not correct. The author(s) conducted the experiment at two locations in two years which makes it four environments. There must be GxE component in the computation of the parameters as indicated below:	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Genotype x Location interaction variance (σ_{GL}^2) = $\frac{MS_{GL} - MS_E}{r}$ Genotypic variance (σ_G^2) = $\frac{MS_G - MS_{GL}}{rl} = \frac{\sigma_E^2 + r\sigma_{GL}^2 + rl\sigma_G^2 - \sigma_E^2 + r\sigma_{GL}^2}{rl}$ Phenotypic variance (σ_p^2) = $\frac{\sigma_G^2 + \sigma_{GL}^2}{1} + \frac{\sigma_E^2}{rl} = \frac{\sigma_G^2 + (MS_{GL} - MS_E)/r}{1} + \frac{\sigma_E^2}{rl}$ Error Variance (σ_E^2) = MS_E In view of this all the other parameters like PVC, GCV, heritability and GA will be affected. The author(s) made reference to Allard and ought to have known that analysis such as this requires that at least ANOVA table was provided to guide audience. The sample size (the number of genotypes used in this study) is too small to me for such an analysis) Results and Discussion Based on the above, results and inferences made from Line 137 – 213 may be misleading, and since this	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	portion is the pillar of this manuscript	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript was very readable due to clarity of language used.	