



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_49407
Title of the Manuscript:	ROLE OF PREVALENT WEEDS AND CULTIVATED CROPS IN THE EPIDEMIOLOGY OF MAIZE LETHAL NECROSIS DISEASE IN MAJOR MAIZE GROWING AGROECOLOGICAL ZONES OF UGANDA
Type of the Article	Review 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	In my opinion the statistics used are not appropriate but also are not needed. When there are so many zeros, X^2 can't be used appropriately, and the fact that different weeds prevail in different regions does not require testing. IN general the hypothesis being tested to produce the values is not at all clear.	Following extensive consultation with my co authors, it was agreed that the data in the table is maintained because the analysis is valid. Although the reviewer expressed concern that there are too many zeros, in fact the zero is used as categorical data indicating absence while 1 indicates presence of a particular weed species. Hence the type of data is categorical data and can in fact be analysed using a chisquare analysis. The null hypothesis being tested is that no differences exist in the frequency of occurrence of specific weed species among farms in different agroecological zones. The authors therefore humbly differ with the reviewer.
Minor REVISION comments	See suggested editing. The appropriate corrections have been made and highlighted in the revised paper	Following review of the Chi square analysis. Corrections were made in table 3 and the three columns with chi square data removed. Why do some results not agree with ELISA comment on section 3.4. The explanation was given in the discussion section on page 18, line 368-373. The suggestion to rearrange the species according to frequencies is noted. "For these small sample sizes, % is not needed". This has now been calculated based on cumulative results for all the seasons and hence its presented in the combined tables 5 and 6 on pages 10 and 12 respectively.
Optional/General comments	Good work but lots of overkill in the analysis repeating table data; could readily be shortened to improve readability.	This has been addressed by merging tables 5-7 for weed hosts and tables 8-9 for cultivated crops

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)	