



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13411
Title of the Manuscript:	Induction of Resistance in Cocoyam (<i>Xanthosoma sagittifolium</i>) to <i>Pythium myriotylum</i> by Corm Treatments with Benzothiadiazole and its Effect on Vegetative Growth
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Root rot disease of cocoyam is one of the most important disease caused by fungus, <i>Pythium myriotylum</i>. This paper showed the double roles of BTH on disease resistance and growth promotion of cocoyam had significant theoretical and practical scientific merits. I commended accept this paper after minor revision. However, the English writing need minor revisions. SD bars should marked in Fig.1 and Table 1. In addition, I suggest that the content of 3.1 and 3.3 in manuscript should put together, which looks more logical.	By separating the contents 3.1 and 3.3 we wanted to clearly differentiate the induced resistance effect of BTH from its eventual direct antagonism against <i>P. myriotylum</i>.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		