

SDI Review Form 1.6

SCIENCEDOMAIN international
www.sciencedomain.org



Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10275
Title of the Manuscript:	Field evaluation of the effectiveness of thermotherapy against cassava mosaic disease in Central African Republic
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		
Minor REVISION comments	Minor REVISION. The authors did not follow the scope of the journal; they should present in the abstract, the Aim of the study, the Study Design, the Place and Duration of the Study, the Methodology, the Results and the Conclusion. The authors have to respect that. So, the authors should remove the following sentence: "Cassava mosaic disease (CMD) I considered the most important biotic constraint and it greatly reduces yields. Some study shows that thermotherapy is a way to control the CMD in Africa", and show the aim of the study. The abstract should be read as follows: Aim: The effectiveness of thermotherapy in mapping cassava mosaic disease (CMD) was studied on a..... Study Design: Place and Duration of Study: Methodology: Results: Conclusion:	



Optional/General comments	General comments The authors could have showed the evolution of the disease on the infected plants during the whole period of the experiment by using logarithmic transformations; these transformations could, in terms of the development of the disease, give an idea on the effectiveness of the method used to control the disease. In epidemiology, we have many models for proving the efficiency of the methods used. By using only statistic calculations to prove the finding made by the authors is not sufficient. Because what we need, is the level of the disease on the plants freed of disease; or what is the behaviour of these freed plants from disease in real conditions.	Thank we get the point to your remark but we don't know how logarithmic transformation method has to be done may show us the procedure. Concerning the evolution disease on plant freed we have already commented in CMD incidence chapter. (The rapid increasing CMD incidence (from 5% to 100%) on the Reunion cultivar during the first three months of the growth confirmed the high susceptibility of this cultivar to CMD and the serious constraint of this disease in the Central African Republic even in the case of a low abundance of whiteflies.) For a better understanding may you review that chapter
---	---	---