



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_15563
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF HOST PLANT TOLERANCE AND DISEASE PRESSURE ON THE SPREAD OF CASSAVA BROWN STREAK DISEASE IN 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	1. Author to carefully correct the grammatical and structural errors in the body of the work as highlighted in the corrected manuscript. 2. Abstract should be re-crafted, <u>without use of sub-headings</u>, in one homogenous paragraph reflecting an opening problem statement, this study and its objective(s), methodology used, results, conclusion and recommendations (if any). 3. The introduction may be expanded to address the problem better. At the end, the objectives of the work need to be clearly articulated. 4. In results section, I am of the impression that the same data was represented both as tables and figures. If so, only one option should be maintained (tables or figures). 5. In reference section, all co-authors must be written in full and not use of <i>et al.</i> Editing in this section should be carefully done for consistency of commas, hyphenating, bolding, full-stops etc. as highlighted in manuscript.	1. I have critically corrected all the errors in the manuscript. 2. The abstract has been re-structured accordingly. 3. The authors are convinced that the introduction is sufficient. The objective of the study is clearly articulated in line 44 and 45 4. Table 4 & 5 have been removed 5. All co-authors have been written in full in the reference section
Minor REVISION comments	1. In the topic, I suggest use of the word "resistance" instead of "tolerance" since tolerance is a form of resistance. If agreed, this should be consistent throughout the work. 2. Figures in results section could be reduced to fit in less space i.e. Figs. 1 and 2 could be Fig. 1 a and b while figures 3, 4, 5 could be on one page as Fig. 2 a, b and c. 3. Titles of tables and figures in the work could be reduced. i.e. <i>five , 3-6 or 12 months after planting</i> should be eliminated from titles but explained in the text. 4. Certain paragraphs need rephrasing for clarity as indicated in manuscript. 5. Table 6 (page 13, lines 187-189) could be modified by another row being added above heading to accommodate	The word tolerance has been replaced with Resistance in the title and everywhere else in the manuscript except in the conclusion where tolerance is mentioned in relation to NASE 3 and MM96/0686. This is because currently there is no cassava variety that is resistant to CBSD but rather just tolerant to the disease. 4. the vague paragraphs have been improved for clarity 5. the table has been improved accordingly



SDI Review Form 1.6

	"Foliar" (CBSD % incidence and Total weight) and "Root" (CBSD % incidence and Mean severity).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Need for careful general proof-reading of the work.	I have carefully proof read this version of the manuscript