



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_14814
Title of the Manuscript:	Mycelia growth and sporulation of <i>Phytophthora colocasiae</i> isolates under selected conditions
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	Please see General Comments	The manuscript has been comprehensively reviewed following the comments.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Abstract</p> <p>The abstract is particularly confusing and needs revision. It should be informative and include significant data, and point out the major findings and conclusions.</p> <p>“Incubation in both light and dark was best for mycelia growth and sporulation” what is the meaning by this sentence?</p> <p>Also, the abstract missed the last conclusion.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The introduction needs revision. The authors should considerer to mention more actual references.</p> <p>I miss some information about the fungus <i>Phytophthora colocasiae</i> and also about the factors that affect leaf blight disease of taro plant.</p> <p>Also, a few sentences about the factors that affect the growth and sporulation of this fungus would be</p>	<p>A review has been done on the abstract with information on useful data and major findings and conclusion as indicated in yellow.</p> <p>The sentence quarrelled has been rephrased and conclusion updated</p> <p>Additional sub topic on <i>Phytophthora colocasiae</i> disease aetiology and factor affecting disease development has been included</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>informative.</p> <p>M&M</p> <p>The M&M section also needs serious revision. I also found this section in some cases incomplete. As corrected in the reviewed manuscript, some descriptions and details are needed.</p> <p>I considerer that more explanations are needed. For example, why to test the mycelia growth and sporulation density at these temperatures and pH?.</p> <p>I considerer that the sentence “(BL/SM123, BL/SM120) and two local cultivars (Dark green petiole, White petiole)” is repetitive.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>I find the results section confusing and flowed. It should be improved. In Figure 1 the growth of the fungus is not clear. It have to be informative.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Discussions are largely repeating the results but lack the explanations. An integrative discussion/evaluation of the data that summarizes the findings should be added. The authors should concentrate on what is sound and novel. I also miss some more actual references.</p>	<p>The explanation on the study on mycelia growth and sporulation has also been included and corrections made by reviewer accepted.</p> <p>M&M section has been revised to give some important details.</p> <p>This section has been modified to avoid repetition</p> <p>Result section has also been improved and issue with fig 1 addressed.</p> <p>Discussion has been comprehensively reviewed to capture the findings and adequate inferences on earlier works and the references updated</p>
--	--	--