



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
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	<p>Introduction: Summary of Literature on similar studies in the introduction is weak. Granted the difficulty in conducting the said experiments and thus scarcity of relevant information on taro, authors could have at least referred to similar studies elsewhere on other roots and tubers. Also, ideas/ information used in the introduction were not duly cited/ referenced. Comments given in text.</p> <p>Materials and Methods Two-way ANOVA is more appropriate compared to ANOVA since the authors investigated the effect of variety and harvesting time on the accumulation of dry matter and nutrient use efficiency. It is unclear how the authors determined nutrient use efficiency. This limits the ease of reproducibility by other investigators should the need arise.</p> <p>Results and Discussion <i>Dry matter accumulation by various plant 162 organ:</i> There was not a single reference to earlier studies even for other root and tuber crops. Thus the discussion was one-sided with the discourse being reduced to trends observed in the data but with no in-depth discussion of possible causes of the observed trends. Authors must rectify this to enrich the discussion.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	These have been made in-text for authors consideration.	
Optional/General comments	The investigation was carried out under experimental conditions. However, the import of the findings under natural/ common planting environments was not well discussed.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ibok Oduro</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Food Science and Technology, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana</i>