



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_22981
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield losses and Path Coefficient analysis of Head Smut disease (<i>Tolyposporium penicillariae</i>) in Pearl millet genotypes
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	■ Verify if all the references cited in the text are listed in the references section. For example, ICRISAT (2013) cited in the introduction can't be found in the references section. ■ Results should be reported in the results and discussion section in accordance with related tables and figures. This seems not to be always the case. For example, results reported in lines 122-123 (Overall mean yield for all the four seasons in the two sites was 2.65 tons ha⁻¹ in the protected experiment and 2.39 tons ha⁻¹ for the diseased experiment) can't be found in Table 1. Furthermore, It is not mentioned somewhere in the material and methods section that the experiments were done during four seasons and which seasons were concerned. See also lines 160-161 [Based on yield loss in unprotected plots as compared to protected plots the percent yield loss ranged from 2-34% (Table 1)]. They are many such cases. ■ Refer the results reported to the respective tables or figures. For example, from the line 122 to the line 162, there are various different results in percentages reported. But only table 1 is referred and many of these numbers (percentages) do not exist in this table. ■ The title of the result and discussion subtitle in line 159 does not reflect the results reported thereafter as well as the figures referred. ■ The figure of line 163-164 has no title ■ Figures should not comprise horizontal lines ■ Titles of figures should be placed below/at the bottom. Titles of tables should precede them. These titles should be as most complete as possible, so that one does not need to read the text in order understand the figures or tables. In this context, the meanings of all abbreviations used should each time be given the title.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	■ Figure axis title should be written ■ The results should not most of the time be discussed in term of “such results have been reported by” or “these results are similar to those of who found that”. Authors should try to find out scientific reasons why the results obtained are like they are. ■ The sentence of lines 255-256 has no conjugated verb. See also corrections to be made in sentence in the section “Minor REVISION comments”	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Line 6: Bref. is a devastating Line 38: <i>penicillariae</i> Bref. (Bhatt,1946) Line 40: According to King (1992) Lines 48-49: small scale farmers instead of small..... Line 53-60: - degree should be abbreviated as ° and 0 - Write m.a.s.l in full (m above the sea level) Line 58-59: It is not easy to understand the meaning of the following sentence: The centre is situated in agro ecological zone 5 (LM5)??? soils are volcanic fluvisols of sandy/silty clay loam texture, 59 slightly acidic to slightly alkaline with mean annual rainfall of 654mm. Line 60: minimum and maximum temperatures Line 66: Write ICRISAT in full Line 68: Write experiment A instead of Expt. A Line 71: yield losses ~~from~~ due to the disease Line 72: experiment A instead of Expt. A Line 76: ~~Data collected on disease~~ Disease data collection Line 77: every ~~7~~ seven days. General remark : numbers from 0 to 9 should be written in letter Line 78: Add references to the title of the figure 1 Line 92-93: as ~~compare by calculating the~~ compared to the calculated yield differences between the two experiments Line 95 : (Bock <i>et al.</i>, 2010): Line 97: (reduction of the parameters grain yield) Line 98: mean yield of respective genotype Line 116: The greatest amount of variance ~~is~~ was assigned to Line 117: The second ~~principle~~ principal component Line 118: The total sum of the ~~principle~~ principal components Line 133-134: Cancel the sentence "Overall mean yield for all the four seasons in the two sites was 2.65 tons ha⁻¹ for the protected plots as compared to 2.39 tons ha⁻¹ in the diseased plots ». Because the the same sentence can be found in lines 122-123 Line 146: yield losses. ~~these~~ Such results were also reported by Rao <i>et al</i> Line 149: severity per genotype. ~~such~~ Such results have been Lines 150-152: The sentence « Highly susceptible genotypes like	
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	SDMV 94014 respectively » has no conjugated verb Line 170: ~~lossesall~~ losses all Lines 222-223: It was positively associated with panicle length (0.16) and diameter (0.09) ~~0.16 and 0.09, respectively~~ Lines 225-228: ~~Cancel~~ « The sign indicates the direction of relationship between the components and the variables. Those with appositive sign indicate that the variables are positively related to the PC while those with a negative sign are negatively related to the PC (Broschat, 1979) » ~~Because similar sentences already exist in lines 208-2011~~ Lines 255-256: Development and ~~selection~~ selection of genotypes that produce ~~beeter~~ better yields and ~~resits~~ resist to abiotic and biotic stresses in ASALs in critical in ~~maintaing~~ maintaining farmers productivity and food security. Lines 262-263 : ~~Check if the following is correct:~~ "IP 8783 though not among the highest in yield did not lose much to the disease hence should be included in a breeding programme for genetic studies on resistance to <i>Tolyposporium penicillarie</i> » ~~What does it mean ?~~ Line 268: The findings ~~frim~~ from this study ~~shiwed~~ showed that	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jean Aghofack Nguemezi
Department, University & Country	Department Of Plant Biology, University Of Dschang, Cameroon