**SDI Review Form 1.6**

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **American Journal of Experimental Agriculture** |
| Manuscript Number: | **2015_AJEA_17532** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Temporal dynamics of Napier Grass Stunt Disease as influenced by Napier grass clones and initial inoculum** |
| Type of the Article | **Original research paper** |

## 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 | | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | The goals are very interesting, and investigations for discovering new opportunities for improving the grass production are very welcomed. However this paper needs to be improved.<br>In this paper needs to be done a review of English.<br><br>The introduction needs to be improved. The author needs to describe better the commercial application of the grass, and its growth potential in normal conditions (not infected plantations). The results discussion could be better presented, but they are satisfactory. However it is missing a conclusion, it is essential for the reader. There is no conclusion in this paper (only in the abstract). | All suggestions have been attended to as highlighted in yellow in the text |
| **Optional/General** comments | | |