



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_28893
Title of the Manuscript:	A combination fungicide for the management of blast and sheath blight disease of paddy
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. In line no. 20. What about % disease incidence of blast disease? 2. In line no. 41. Need more explanation 3. In line no. 44 and 61. Coat few examples for the statements. 4. In line no. 49, 55, 112, 117 and 125. Point out PDI for each treatment in brackets. 5. In line no. 121, 135 and 136. More reference requires. 6. In line no. 146. Coat the results. 7. In line no. 147 and 148. Requires your justification. 8. Check space between the words throughout the reference list. 9. In table – 1: One more column required to show the initial PDI of Blast disease because in “Materials and Methods” noticed that “Blast disease was evaluated based on natural disease incidence”. 10. In Table – 1, 2 and 3: Check the spaces. 11. What about the dose of treatment 'T9' in Table 1 and 3.	We have not calculated the percent incidence as it will not reflect the disease severity for foliar diseases. Therefore, we have calculated PDI and presented This part is elaborated. We have cited many references to support our statement. We have cited references to support our statement. Necessary citations were included. Necessary corrections were included Necessary modification is incorporated Necessary corrections were included Table has been modified as per the suggestion Table has been modified as per the suggestion It is a unsprayed control. We have modified the table
Minor REVISION comments	1. In line no. 76. Use symbol	Table has been modified as per the suggestion Necessary corrections were included



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. In line no. 22. Change '-' into 'to' 3. In line no. 42. Mention Name of the rice variety 4. In line no. 78. Use subscript 5. "Comma" missing 6. In line no. 100. 'Produce' replaced by "Product"	Necessary corrections were included Modified as per the suggestion
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		