

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_82192
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Spacing and Pruning Methods on Root Yield and Yield Parameters of Cassava (Manihot esculenta Crantz ) in Fedis District, East Harerghe Zone, Ethiopia
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.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJAHR/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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript "Effect of spacing and pruning methods on root yield and yield parameters of cassava (Manihot esculenta crantz) in Fedis District, East Harerghe Zone, Ethiopia" reports the effects of different plant spacing (0.60, 0.80, 1.00, 1.20 and 1.40 m) and pruning methods (cutback, debranching and no pruning). The finding reveals high significance for root number per plant, root length, average root weigh and unmarketable root number due to effect of pruning while no significant difference was observed for total root yield as a result of intra-row spacing. It also shows significant interactive effects for marketable and total root yield as result of intra-row spacing and pruning</p> <p>The study confirms the expected, however the author should emphasize on the importance of the study with respect to the advantage of intercropping. The readers should understand the gain of threading off high yield of cassava as result of pruning methods. Discussion of the findings should be substantiated with more reference to related studies.</p>	Comment accepted and considered
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	There is need for minor corrections on the highlighted text. Some of the texts lacked clarity and need to be rephrased for better understanding for the readers. The result and discussion section should be substantiated with more points as relates the importance of the study to intercropping. Two of the reference were not cited within the text and should be incorporated.	Comment accepted and considered
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>