



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_26120
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicity of fungicides inhibitors to Phytophthora megakarya in cacao
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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	The work is good and could highly contribute towards toxicity in the final products in crop production. However, there are serious issues to be addressed. I suggest the title indicate the study was about management of the pest in question. Issues to be addressed: Abstract: Study design, is not correctly written, consult a statistician. Material and Methods: 1. The study should indicate the experimental design, data collection and the number of replications. 2. The study could not be repeated by anyone anywhere since the method used are not well presented which makes the work unpublishable. 3. Authors indicated that studies were repeated three times, but no indication on how was it statistically performed. 4. Method of analysis not well outlined. Results and Discussion 5. The first paragraph do not outline the results, instead authors started by discussing the results that are not yet presented. Only the last sentence starts outlining table 1, where T should be capitalised.	All issues raised are addressed: Experimental design: CRD Statistical analysis: Probit analysis and calculation of percent inhibition of <i>P. megakarya</i> by concentrations of the active ingredients. The study is reproducible as itemized in the materials and methods. The repetition of the experiment was already factored into the data before analysis.
Minor REVISION comments		Issues raised are taken care of.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. A statistician needs to be consulted with regard to the experimental design of the study, which is the critical part in the publication of scientific articles. 2. An English editor is highly recommended.	
---	---	--