



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | American Journal of Experimental Agriculture |
| Manuscript Number: | 2014_AJEA_14814 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Mycelia growth and sporulation of <i>Phytophthora colocasiae</i> isolates under selected conditions |
| 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) |
|--|--|--|
| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | Please see General Comments | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | <p>Abstract</p> <p>The abstract is particularly confusing and needs revision. It should be informative and include significant data, and point out the major findings and conclusions.</p> <p>"Incubation in both light and dark was best for mycelia growth and sporulation" what is the meaning by this sentence?</p> <p>Also, the abstract missed the last conclusion.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The introduction needs revision. The authors should consider to mention more actual references.</p> <p>I miss some information about the fungus <i>Phytophthora colocasiae</i> and also about the factors that affect leaf blight disease of taro plant.</p> <p>Also, a few sentences about the factors that affect the growth and sporulation of this fungus would be informative.</p> <p>M&M</p> | |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>The M&M section also needs serious revision. I also found this section in some cases incomplete. As corrected in the reviewed manuscript, some descriptions and details are needed.</p> <p>I considerer that more explanations are needed. For example, why to test the mycelia growth and sporulation density at these temperatures and pH?.</p> <p>I considerer that the sentence "(BL/SM123, BL/SM120) and two local cultivars (Dark green petiole, White petiole)" is repetitive.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>I find the results section confusing and flowed. It should be improved. In Figure 1 the growth of the fungus is not clear. It have to be informative.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Discussions are largely repeating the results but lack the explanations. An integrative discussion/evaluation of the data that summarizes the findings should be added. The authors should concentrate on what is sound and novel. I also miss some more actual references.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Name: | Anonymous |
| Department, University & Country | Ain Shams University, Egypt |