



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_29059
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of Disease Resistant Varieties against Brown Leaf Spot Disease of Paddy
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript entitled "Screening of Disease Resistant Varieties against Brown Leaf Spot Disease of Paddy" reports the level of brown spot disease severity in a group of 25 rice varieties. First of all, the text needs a full English professional review. Material and Methods – the first paragraph of this section is important only for field experiments; change it for the "Field screening" section. Also, add the weather information for those annual periods. Also in all sub-topics of this section is not explained how the experiments were made. Re-do it. Add information like: the medium used, the temperature, time and other conditions for plant or bacterial growth, age of plant when inoculated, etc. Finally, add a topic explaining how the "Percent of Infection" was measured. In fact, I could not find the Junaid A.K. (2000) reference. "Discussion" section is indeed results. In fact, the figures in "Discussion" are far better then the tables in "Results". The authors must delete the "Results" section and change the "Discussion" to "Results". Only the last paragraph from "Discussion" is in fact a discussion. Finally, the research quality as the English in all most	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	incomprehensible and how the experiments were made is poorly explained.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I would suggest change the word paddy in the title for rice or yet <i>Oryza sativa</i> . References need formatting throughout the text, and in the "Reference" section.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Brazilian National Centre of Research in Energy and Materials, Brazil