



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_47376
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of the potato production system in the soil suppressiveness to bacterial wilt
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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	While I appreciate the care with which it was carried out, I have several limitations. The interpretations of systematic methodologies and critical data may be further improved. The use of monitoring information and practical mass balance may be needed. In view of environmental factors, its differential meaning (compared to previous ones) may be interconnectively discussed with additive information. The form of presentation may be reorganized and improved.	Interpretation: a careful revision in the data interpretation was carried out in order to follow the reviewer recommendations. Mass evaluation: the authors understand the mass variables would be of no value to the interpretation of results. Mass variables use to have a high variation in disease incidence experiments, giving a poor information. Environmental factors: the difference among treatments from distinct environments were further discussed in order to follow the reviewer recommendations. Form of presentation: the authors have made improvements in the form of presentation in order to follow the reviewer recommendation

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	