



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>                                |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JEAI_33915</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>IMPACT OF FUNGICIDE APPLICATION ON TARO LEAF BLIGHT DISEASE IN THREE REGIONS OF CAMEROON.</b> |
| 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**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|--|---|---|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | <p>Find below the review comments</p> <p>The article was full of jointed words which hinder flow reading</p> <p>The topic was apt.</p> <p>The methodology was well written except that the author need to specify the number of treated corms with fungiforce. The statement that some corms were treated with fungiforce was correct.</p> <p>The result was equally well written except that the author fails to report the effect of fungiforce on corms before planting.</p> <p>The result of treated corms with fungiforce before planting is crucial to the overall outcome of this work since fungiforce is both contact and systemic in actions.</p> <p>In addition, concentration suitable for control was not reported.</p> <p>Discussion section of the work was robust but the author delve into aspect of nutritional aspect of cocoyam was not required as that was not his finding and was taken care of in the introduction.</p> | OK  |



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | The conclusion was well drawn.                          |  |
|   | The references were relevantly and appropriately cited. |  |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments   |   |  |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments |   |  |