



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_18473
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Distribution of cassava mosaic geminiviruses and their associated DNA satellites in Kenya.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Corrections are indicated on the hardcopy. A few (not all) comments are highlighted:</p> <p>Various inconsistencies in results (percentages in tables and descriptions in the text) were found (e.g. line 298, 327 and many more).</p> <p>Inconsistent referral to CMD, CMB and CMG (e.g. line 201, 205, 267, 367, 439).</p> <p>Order provinces in the same order in Tables 1-4.</p> <p>Incidence and prevalence requires definitions.</p> <p>Better explanation of "satellite symptoms", whether this is observed after gDNA isolation and PCR or if it is characteristic visual symptoms (lines 105, 307).</p> <p>Give better explanation on how integrated and episomal satellites are distinguished (lines 176, 184, 274-275, 347-349, 390-392).</p> <p>Lack of results for some conclusions. No data is presented that supports lines 367, 372-373, 383. Jumps to conclusions. See also line 428.</p> <p>Number of samples: 3-4 per field vs 30 plants per field (line 121 vs 100).</p> <p>Figures of gels do not have + and - water controls.</p> <p>Re-ordering of Results paragraphs: 107-116 after 85; 118-121 after 105; 255-265 after 233.</p> <p>Co-infection 8% or 21%? (lines 250, 382).</p> <p>Require a heading before line 285, indicating methods of transmission.</p> <p>Whole paragraph (lines 400-407) refers to data that was never presented.</p> <p>References need accurate reformatting for consistence.</p>	



**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.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Description of Materials and Methods for PCR is too elementary.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Inge Gazendam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Agricultural Research council, Vegetable and Ornamental Plant Institute, South Africa</b>