



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_4450
Title of the Manuscript:	Rootstocks influence the Growth, Biochemical Contents and Disease Incidence in Thompson seedless Grapevines
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	In general, manuscript can publish after some corrections. Manuscript English is generally understandable but it will be better to edit. The method used, especially rootstocks and disease association is not very clear. Which method used and how you scored. This part weakest part of the research. Powdery mildew and rootstock relations are not clear and not enough supplied literatures. Also it is not easy to find literature to support this theorem. It should be supply much more literature which is related powdery mildew and rootstock resistance effects. Some of the literatures are quite old and some of them also too repeated. Discussion part is very limited. It is better to discuss much more literatures. Also use new literatures and from different countries not only Indians. Replicates is not clear and only supplied table 1. It should be mention in material and method part. Phenolic analyses information is very limited. It should be mention more.	The article is edited as per the comments given by reviewer. The method used for scoring disease incidence and also the vegetative data is explained in the material and methods section. The supporting literature is also added in the discussion part. The new supporting literature has been added. The discussion part has been re written by incorporating additional literature. New references have also been incorporated.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some of the spelling and words are incorrect. For example in line 168, Tangolar and Ergenolu should correct as Tangolar and Ergenoğlu.	The spellings are attended as per the suggestions.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Literatures don't have standart format. Some dates seperated with brackets and some of them not.	The literature have been arranged as per the format.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general, manuscript can publish after some corrections. I can review after corrections again.	NA