

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_90441
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on Evaluation of Sweet Potato (<i>Ipomoea batatus</i> Lam.) Genotypes for High Tuber Yield and Quality
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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevant and necessary due to research merits ▪ Reflects the work <p>The Title is ambiguous:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The word sweet potato represents both the crop/plant and the tuber yield. ▪ Thus, you need to be specific since your interest is not all tuber or root as a crop but, as a root yield. • So add an adjective "tuber yield" to "yield, which reads as "tuber yield", so the reader can easily understand which yield your title, is referring. <p>Missed of administrative locations(at where??)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Required moderate edition</p> <p>Lacks of concluded the sweet potato accessions of the study site as if they were lacking eg:- x, w, s, and z accessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Misuse unit, if interest change units 	
Optional/General comments	<p>Minor edition</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow research guideline 2. Check authors [,,] in body and reference part(uncompleted are there) 3. the objective varied in abstract and in main body b/c not important 4. Do methodology part again particularly sampling technique 5. You should acknowledge authors 6. Come with brief results and discussion 7. Show your research gap clearly 	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Birhanu Lencha Kiffo
Department, University & Country	Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia