SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_45119
Title of the Manuscript:	Field evaluation of some cassava cultivars against the African Cassava Mosaic disease in the humid forests of Cameroon
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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	 At what stage(s) was/were the data collected? Many plants were assessed in each experimental plot? There is immediate need to distinguish Severity (scoring scales) from Incidence (percentages), as illustrated in Table 1. Figure 2: that pie-chart doesn't reflect disease incidence at all, and should be replaced with a table or area under disease progress curves for the different varieties and locations. Some general work on grammar, typos, and general writing. 	
Minor REVISION comments	 Clonal and white fly infections are known types in CMD. The authors did not make the difference between the two and what is more common in Cameroon! If the data was collected say at 3, 6, 9, and 12 months after planting, the authors could have shown clearly how CMD progressed in the different varieties and locations. 	
Optional/General comments	It is a good paper in the context of CMD and its management strategies in Cameroon, and demonstrates the use host plant resistance in managing ACMD in the tropics. Should be accepted following the revision of the suggested areas above.	

PART 2.

PART 2.		
		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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alex Abaca
Department, University & Country	National Crops Resources Research Institute , Uganda

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)