

Editor's Comments:

More important objections are listed below:

First of all, the MS is sloppily written and edited!!!. It should be thoroughly revised. It needs an editorial work on the written English. There are a lot of language mistake, the grammatical constructions are strange and incorrect. MS is chaotic and should be improved for better reading and understanding.

Abstract should have the following order: Introductory/rationale statement that leads to an objective statement, then a description of the experimental design/treatments, what was measured, results, and major conclusions.

The obtained results are analyzed insufficient. The authors wrote that the results were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA). However, there are no results from this analysis in the text or in figures. Results should be analyzed by analysis of variance using ANOVA to determine the percentage of the variation attributable to the factors tested. The results of these analysis should be clearly indicated (significant effect of these factors as well as interaction between them). It is not possible to correctly assess the obtained results without accurate statistical analysis!!!.

Discussion section is poorly written. Results should be discussed in more details with results obtained by other researchers.

The relevance/importance of results needs to be explained more fully. Conclusions could be written more to the point.

Author's Feedback:

Dear Editor,

Thanks for your critical review comments.

The following questions below have been responded to accordingly. The revised manuscript and reviewers responses attached.

Thanks

- ☐ Words have been separated
- ☐ Number of treated corms specified in methodology and abstract
- ☐ The effect of fungicide on corms before planting has been corrected
- ☐ Control field consisted of unsprayed taro plants
- ☐ The nutritional aspect of taro in the discussion has been removed

- ☐ References have been corrected in the text and at the end of manuscript according to standards of journal
- ☐ The field design is complete randomize block design that was used, tables have been compressed
- ☐ Abstract has been reduced
- ☐ Cultivars have been incorporated in to the materials and method section
- ☐ Factorial arrangement/design was not used in this study
- ☐ The table have not been condensed
- ☐ The active ingredient of fungicide is stated in the text
- ☐ The frequency of fungicide application is stated in the methodology
- ☐ The author tried other fungicides and that was the most effective
- ☐ The corrections on manuscript have been done and highlighted in yellow except areas that were delete that are not highlighted
- ☐ F1 F1A etc have been put in the methodology