



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10884
Title of the Manuscript:	Host suitability of cut-flowers to <i>Meloidogyne</i> spp. and population dynamics of <i>M. hapla</i> on the rootstock <i>Rosa corymbifera</i> 'Laxa'
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Accepted after major revision 1. There are citations absent from the literature and vice versa. 2. The Discussion is too extended and should be condensed. 3. The English style requires revision. 4. In Table 2 the column Nr of nematodes stained in root means the total number or nematodes per g or root? 5. In Table 1 the column Nematodes per g of root is not clear. In this experiment only eggs from root were counted and the sum of egg number and juveniles in soil used to estimate RF.	1. Text and References were updated accordingly (see also comments made by Reviewer 1 & 3) 2. Unfortunately, the authors give no details in what perspective the Discussion should be condensed. We once read the Discussion again and agreed to leave it as it is for the following reasons: (1) Overall length of the Discussion is within the range of scientific papers like this one; (2) the different cut-flower species need to be addressed separately and (3) all aspects discussed are directly related to the results and therefore relevant. 3. This is a very general comment and no examples are given what might irritate the reviewer. Also far from being perfect we consider the English style proper for this type of scientific paper. 4. Text was modified to read “total number of nematode per root system”



SDI Review Form 1.6

		5.Text was modified to read “Nematodes per g root fresh weight”. This should make it clear.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		