



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_33915
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF FUNGICIDE APPLICATION ON TARO LEAF BLIGHT DISEASE IN THREE REGIONS OF CAMEROON.
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>This manuscript needs to be revised grammatically. Words are not properly capitalized, no proper sentence spacing, citations are not properly cited, and many other issues. I would strongly suggest that the authors employ someone that understands English writing to help with the manuscript preparation. Also, tables are hard to understand and can be condensed into a shorter version while presenting the same information. I could spend many hours correcting this manuscript but until the authors make the major corrections suggested it is not any use spending more time on this manuscript. As mentioned below this data set is not properly analysed since it is a factorial arrangement of tago cultivars by Fungiforce dose. See specific comments below</p> <p>P1.. Abstract needs to be shortened. Just state the facts and don't just say 'the highest disease incidence was recorded at Ekonawith with the lowest disease incidence at Yaounde.' Be specific give actual values.</p> <p>P2..FAO is listed as '9' in References but not here in first paragraph. Fontem and Mbong is not citation 15</p> <p>P3..List taro cultivars. No mention of cultivars until Figures. Incorporate the cultivars into the M&M section and then the discussion</p> <p>P4..Reference 21 is not Fokunang</p> <p>P5..Reference JMP 8. Since you are evaluating 4 cultivars versus different doses of FungiForce you have a factorial arrangement of treatments but this is not mentioned anywhere in the M&M section.</p> <p>P6-34..too many tables. This data can be condensed into less tables and still present all the information. Tables basically have same title ie., Table 2 and 9,etc.</p>	This comments are valid and has been taken care of in the text in consideration with the other three reviewers comments
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		