



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Biotechnology Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BBJ_14317
Title of the Manuscript:	Screen house and field resistance of taro cultivars to taro leaf blight disease (<i>Phytophthora colocasiae</i>)
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	<p>Line 152-154, Rephrase these sentences. Suggestion "There were cultivar variations on disease resistance in terms of the small lesion lengths and days of leaf collapse and defoliation. No leaf collapse and defoliation but holes were observed on BL/SM132 at the 14th day."</p> <p>Line 233, what is the meaning of "100% of another disease symptom"</p> <p>Line 251, what is the meaning of "symptoms that were not classical for the tested fungal disease"</p> <p>Line 266, "9.0±0.0 mm" may need to be changed to "9.0±0.0".</p> <p>Line 322, it is not clear. What is the meaning of "classical symptom of another disease"?</p>	Ok
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Table 5 and 6, It might be better to use "N.A." instead of "0.0±0.0" in the results of BL/SM132.</p> <p>Line 288, It is better to change "The percentageincidence" to "the incidence percentage".</p>	Ok
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		