



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7190
Title of the Manuscript:	VARIABILITY IN REACTIONS OF GROUNDNUTS VARIETIES TO GROUNDNUT ROSETTE VIRUS ISOLATES FROM UGANDA
Type of the 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	-state clearly the objectives of the study -focus on pathogen variability and its effect on plant performance -why results presented for individual years instead doing pooled analysis and then shaping results and discussion section -experimental design is split plot -explain reasoning why disease so low in 2nd experiment -rewrite discussion based on variability detected in isolates across three regions in Uganda and explain why isolate from a given region is more aggressive in terms of disease development than those from other regions -discuss more about the genotype that showed less disease, if cultivar, its breeding history, are these released cultivars in Uganda, whether these were bred for resistance to GRD etc, more importantly discuss its performance if yield data were recorded -why yield performance not done, even if the trial was conducted in greenhouse	The objective is clearly stated line 56 and 57 This was the focus of the study and table 2 of the results evidence of this I think the results of the individual trials can still work but the discussion has been revisited The experimental design is Randomised complete block design arranged as split plot The low disease could be attributed to the low transmission efficiency of the aphids or interference by the predators This has been done? The Serenuts have been released in the Uganda but they were brought from ICRISAT. Serenut 4T has been released due to vector resistance whereas Serenut 1 and Serenut 3 were released for rosette disease resistant. However, where the disease pressure is high some spraying is



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-check reference, many references cited in the text were not provided details under reference section -Dwiveli et al 2003 should be as Dwivedi et al. 2003. -review similar work on pathogen variability across sub-Saharan Africa which may help you revise the introduction and shape the discussion -more implication, what is the implication of this study to manage GRD in Uganda	recommended to avoid total yield loss (Busolo-Bulafu , 2004). Number of seeds was taken to represent yield performance refer to tables 2 and 3 References have been revised More review on pathogen variability has been undertaken The implication is that this will aid in the breeding for resistance
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		