



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_18473
Title of the Manuscript:	Distribution of cassava mosaic geminiviruses and their associated DNA satellites in Kenya.
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	Corrections are indicated on the hardcopy. A few (not all) comments are highlighted: Various inconsistencies in results (percentages in tables and descriptions in the text) were found (e.g. line 298, 327 and many more). Inconsistent referral to CMD, CMB and CMG (e.g. line 201, 205, 267, 367, 439). Order provinces in the same order in Tables 1-4. Incidence and prevalence requires definitions. Better explanation of "satellite symptoms", whether this is observed after gDNA isolation and PCR or if it is characteristic visual symptoms (lines 105, 307). Give better explanation on how integrated and episomal satellites are distinguished (lines 176, 184, 274-275, 347-349, 390-392). Lack of results for some conclusions. No data is presented that supports lines 367, 372-373, 383. Jumps to conclusions. See also line 428. Number of samples: 3-4 per field vs 30 plants per field (line 121 vs 100). Figures of gels do not have + and – water controls. Re-ordering of Results paragraphs: 107-116 after 85; 118-121 after 105; 255-265 after 233. Co-infection 8% or 21%? (lines 250, 382). Require a heading before line 285, indicating methods of transmission. Whole paragraph (lines 400-407) refers to data that was never presented. References need accurate reformatting for consistence.	-The percentages and descriptions in the text were changed and harmonized as recommended. All duplication statements were deleted. -CMGs term was the adopted reference to the disease in question. In special reference, CMD was singled out as a specific CMG. -Symptoms explained and lifted to 107. Difference between episomal and integrated satellites explained. Distinguished by PCR detection. -Results provided -Statements harmonized. 3-4 per field - The experiment had many samples and the +ve and –ve water controls in first gels of samples 1- 40. This work done sometimes back and difficult to locate all gel pictures. -Results reorganized. -Data provided -References reformatted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Note especially author initials and surname, date in brackets, journal titles abbreviated (or not) and in italics, spaces and punctuation.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Description of Materials and Methods for PCR is too elementary.	- The basic PCR methods deleted as advised.