



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_3509
Title of the Manuscript:	On-farm evaluation of deleafing frequency on the severity of Black Sigatoka Disease (<i>Mycosphaerella fijiensis</i> Morelet) and yield of banana (<i>Musa</i> spp)

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

[\[http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline\]](http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.
 -
 - **General guidelines for Peer Review Process**
 - - SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/web links.
 - Studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new data-set, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter.
 - SDI believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound.
- Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership — both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. SDI journals will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound. Judgments about the importance of any particular paper are then made after publication by the readership (who are the most qualified to determine what is of interest to them).
- Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)
 - Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)
 - Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)
 - Are all the references cited relevant and adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
 - SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language (Unnecessarily harsh words may be modified or removed at the editors' discretion). It is expected that the reviewers should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.

- We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.
- Appeal: Rejected papers are given the opportunity for a formal appeal. Appeal requests should be made in writing, not by telephone, and should be addressed to contact@sciencedomain.org with the word "appeal" in the subject line. If an author remains unsatisfied, he or she can write to the Editorial Office, citing the manuscript reference number. In all these cases, it is likely that some time will elapse before SDI can respond, and the paper must not be submitted for publication elsewhere during this time. Authors should provide detailed reasons for the appeal and point-by-point responses to the reviewers' and/or Academic Editor's comments. Authors should also be aware that priority is given to new submissions to the journal and so the processing of the appeal may well take longer than the processing of the original submission. If an appeal is rejected, further appeals of the decision will not be considered and the paper may not be resubmitted

PART 2: 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 38 states that production of banana in Cameroon is only 280 tons. This a mistake. Figures 3 and 4 do not state what treatment 1, 2, 3 or 4 are	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general the work is well written and presented. However a cost benefit of deleafing (labour cost) would also be helpful	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andrew James
Department, University & Country	Biotechnology Department, Centro de Investigacion Cientifica de Yucatan, Mexico