



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_19395
Title of the Manuscript:	Managing Sclerotinia Blight in Peanut: Evaluation of a Weather-based Forecasting Model to Time Fungicide Applications in Texas
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	Mention the full form of DAP in abstract. Remove grammatical errors Follow the reference pattern of the journal.	DAP was replaced with days after planting in the abstract The manuscript was proof read and grammatical errors were addressed - Formatting of references was adjusted to adhere to the author guidelines (specifically reference 8 (in press))
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Author can check the work done by other authors in the same field for the purpose of manuscript improvement. (http://www.peanutscience.com/doi/pdf/10.3146/i0095-3679-26-2-3)	This symptom was not added; however, several of the references that are included within the paper were included in the original list of references (ie Phipps 1995 and Phipps et al 1997)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Graphical presentation of results will be better	We chose to stay with the tabular form, to streamline the presentation of results among different trials and years.