



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43086
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF CULTURING METHODS FOR <i>Scutellonema bradys</i> IN YAMS
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	Introduction The introduction part has numerous typos and lack of proper citations. Although the flow is ok, I would expect to understand the biology of <i>Scutellonema bradys</i> should be discussed to understand the cycle and multiplication factors under natural conditions. Also an important reference Coyene et al 2011 was not referenced, despite being a recent publication and relevant in the introduction of the manuscript. There is thus a need to include a biology section of the nematode species in question and above all, proper references. More details are highlighted in the manuscript. Objectives of the experiment: The choices of other alternative methods of nematodes culture are not supported. What guided the objectives or these choices? Is it success from other culture technologies of related nematodes species. The evidences of these methods should be supported in the manuscript introduction part. Statistical data analysis How data was handled and analysed is not described in the manuscript. A small part should be included on this important subject. As it is, it's not possible to fully understand the results section since there is no description of the methods used for means separation.	
Minor REVISION comments	There are numerous typos highlighted in the manuscript. The author needs to be consistent with the use of scientific words throughout the manuscript	
Optional/General comments	None	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Peter Mwaura
Department, University & Country	Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya