



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) Some of the sources that are mentioned in the contexts are not included in the "Reference" section. For example: O'Bannon, 1975, Coolen and Hendrickx, 1972. 2) The year for source in the context is mentioned 2011 but in "Reference" it is 1973. (DLV Plant...) also The year for source in the context is mentioned 1975 but in "Reference" it is 1982. (Santo and Lear...). 3) In 'Material and Method' section, it is not what sources are used in order to consider the methods as standard methods. Sources are not mentioned. 4) Why only one thousand nematode eggs and larvae are use used? Why from different population such as 1000, 2000 and 3000 etc.. is not used? So that investigation is done at different population figure. 5) Why both types of <i>M. incognita</i> and <i>M. hapla</i> nematodes are treated together in the pots? If each of the species were inoculated separately in the pot, and then were studied carefully the result would have beer better. 6) On what statistic basis this research is done? 7) Why only one species of the seven species of cut Flowers has been investigated and the figures have not been campared? 8) I believe for the second test if the figures were compared with are another, it could have been better.	1. Text and References were updated accordingly (see also comments made by Reviewer 1 & 2) 2. DLV plant is 2011 and was corrected accordingly in text and References. 3. Santo and Lear is 1976 and was corrected accordingly in text and References. I searched the section for "standard" and was only able to find it in conjunction with growth substrate. "Standard" was deleted as it causes confusion considering the manifold choices for growth substrates available. 4. The inoculums density for Meloidogyne was chosen based on experience with similar experiments. Adding different inoculum densities would mean adding an additional aspect to this work which was not intended. The hypothesis was if different cut-flower species were hosts for <i>M. hapla</i> or <i>M. incognita</i>. To answer this



SDI Review Form 1.6

		question one inoculums density is sufficient. No changes were made in the text as to our opinion it is clear enough in the present form. 5.Maybe this is a misunderstanding. M. hapla and M. incognita were inoculated into different pots. The text in Material and Methods was modified to make this more clearly. 6.The statistics are described in detail in 2.4 Statistical analysis. To our best knowledge, all information are given. 7.The purpose of the second experiment with <i>Rosa corymbifera</i> 'Laxa' was to describe the development of M. hapla on its host plant (days to complete cycle). We choosed <i>R. corymbifera</i> 'Laxa' as test plant because this is the most wide spread used cultivar in cut-flower production. The aim was to have a general information about the speed of nematode development, although it is already known that there is variability between host plants; however, the latter was not an issue in this study. 8.See comment made above.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) In the Abstract, line 12,(Laxa was)!! when the subject is plural, it need plural verb. 2) In the Abstract, line 13, after root system when the sentence is finished we should put full stop and after full stop the sentence begins with a capital letter.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1) Some of the sources used in “Discussion” part and other parts are very old. If it is possible, try to use newer sources. 2) In “Material and Methode” section (plant material and growth condition) what does (2:1,v:v) stard for? 3) In “Reference” Goff CC .First year is written then page number.	Additions changes
		Meressa et al. 2014 describing the first report of M. hapla in Ethiopia was just accepted and therefore added to the text and References