



Asman, SP, MP <asman@agri.unhas.ac.id>

Your Submission

1 message

Annals of Agricultural Science <eesserver@eesmail.elsevier.com>
Reply-To: Annals of Agricultural Science <annals_agrsci@agr.asu.edu.eg>
To: asman@agri.unhas.ac.id

Thu, Aug 20, 2020 at 6:24 PM

Ms. Ref. No.: AOAS-D-20-00334
Title: Rootstock and scion effects on cocoa resistance to vascular streak dieback
Annals of Agricultural Science

Dear Mr. Asman Asman,

The reviewers have commented on your above paper. They indicated that it is not acceptable for publication in its present form.

However, if you feel that you can suitably address the reviewers' comments (included below), I invite you to revise and resubmit your manuscript.

Please carefully address the issues raised in the comments.

If you are submitting a revised manuscript, please also:

a) outline each change made (point by point) as raised in the reviewer comments

AND/OR

b) provide a suitable rebuttal to each reviewer comment not addressed

To submit your revision, please do the following:

1. Go to: <https://ees.elsevier.com/aoas/>
2. Enter your login details
3. Click [Author Login]
This takes you to the Author Main Menu.
4. Click [Submissions Needing Revision]

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Ali Ali, Ph.D.
Editor in Chief
Annals of Agricultural Science

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #2: The authors assessed the effect of all possible rootstock x scion combinations of a selection of 5 cocoa genotypes in South-Sulawesi on vascular streak dieback (VSD) prevalence on cocoa leaves. This research might yield important knowledge on rootstock x scion interaction in breeding for, and propagation of VSD-resistant cocoa genotypes. However, there are several concerns related to the experimental design and conclusions that authors draw from their experiment:

1. No hypothesis is provided on the physiological mechanism that could explain how rootstocks can confer VSD-resistance to a leaf-infesting cocoa disease. If there would be some kind of induced systemic resistance (ISR) or other mechanisms, authors should elaborate on it. Also the discussion is very superfluous and does not touch upon plant physiological mechanisms that explain rootstock x scion interactions that prevail in VSD-resistance/-susceptibility.

2. Only five clones were selected for this research, which can be justified since otherwise the number of rootstock x scion combinations would exceed practical limits. However, sampling criteria should have been made very clear, which is not the case in the present paper. Were clones selected that were particularly resistant or susceptible to VSD? What about other selection criteria? § 2.1. provides too little information. Pod colour is a not so important clone characteristic in relation to the author's study.
3. § 2.5 is inadequate/incomplete: how many evaluations have been done? During what period?
4. AUDPC is calculated based on 'disease percentage': what does that mean? The % of plants showing any VSD-infestation symptom whatsoever (regardless of the VSD-scale)? Also in the results section 'disease percentages' are mentioned without being clear what they mean.
5. I suppose table 1 is reporting the disease scores 'I' as calculated according to the formula mentioned in § 2.5.? (not clear).
6. In § 2.6, it is mentioned that ANOVA was done to test the effect of the rootstock, which is confusing, as the reader wonders if you did not test the effect of the scions. Nevertheless, statistical analysis was done assuming there was a single factor (all 25 rootstock x scion combinations). In fact authors have used two factors (scion and clone) and should treat their data accordingly.
7. As I see it, main conclusion should be that VSD-resistance is linked to the scion (branches and leaf) characteristics, rather than to rootstock characteristics, and that VSD resistance breeding should focus on scions. The conclusion (as is the case with the discussion section) is very superfluous.
8. Language must improve. Authors should find a native speaker to correct style, spelling and vocabulary of sentences that are currently sometimes not understandable at all.

More (detailed) comments can be found the attached annotated pdf.

Reviewer #3: This paper reports an interesting study of the interaction between scion and rootstock in determining incidence and severity of VSD of some well-known cocoa clones that are important in Sulawesi, Indonesia. Much work has been put into the study and the experiment was well designed (with the limitations I have mentioned below). It has produced some interesting results, especially highlighting the very clear difference in degree of resistance between the five clones. However, the paper needs some rewriting to bring out its full potential, as I have explained in the detailed comments below. Table 1 and factorial ANOVA could really show the results in a better light. I think it is well worth publishing after some re-writing. I am happy to help with rewriting.

Page 1

Abstract lines 3 - 5 - Should read 'The planting of cacao clones with partial resistance to VSD has been useful in managing the disease. These have been produced by grafting or budding selected resistant types of cocoa on to unselected seedlings.'

Introduction line 51 - should be 'dieback' instead of 'dying'

Line 53 - VSD does NOT cause 'huge losses globally' - VSD is currently confined to SE Asia and parts of Melanesia, and in PNG is considered a minor disease because of planting of more resistant types of cocoa.

Line 55 - should read 'In Sulawesi an upsurge in VSD incidence since 2000 has caused many farmers to abandon cacao as a crop.'

Line 58 - what did Ali et al. 2019 contribute to an understanding of the pathogen cause of VSD? For that matter none of these references contributed to that information? The reference here should be Keane and Prior 1991, if not Keane et al. 1972

Page 2

Line 4 - 'The pathogen spreads ---' 'is thought to penetrate' (this is not proven)

Line 21 - fungicides have not been shown to be effective in the field

Line 23 - I doubt that biocontrol agents have been proved to be effective - these experiments were inconclusive

Line 28 - should be 'branches'

Line 29 - Sanitation pruning is not necessarily impractical - it requires a farmer to pay more attention to pest and disease control. Replace 'usage' with 'use'. An Indonesian reference Soekirman and Purwantara 1992 should be cited here - giving data on effective use of sanitation pruning when applied routinely (on a large plantation). See ref. Marelli et al (cited in your paper)

Line 31 - 'has been promoted to farmers'. Insert 'Planting of resistant genotypes has been successful in controlling the disease in Papua New Guinea, Malaysia and Indonesia since the 1980s and many partially resistant clones have been selected and widely planted. These have combined resistance with high yield and quality (e.g. PBC123 - S1). (Keane, pers.comm., Extension Manual, Efron)'

Lines 31 - 38 - I dispute most of these statements. The delivery of resistant genotypes to farmers is not a major challenge - it has been done effectively in Malaysia and PNG since the 1970s, leading to a decline in the importance of VSD. Partial but adequate resistance has been combined with high yield and quality (see PBC23 and many clones in PNG).

Line 36 - resistant genotypes do not mostly have low productivity (look at PBC123 - S1)

Line 41 - 'of a plant' - 'desirable properties of both the scion and rootstock'

Line 44 - but Phytophthora foot rot and Phylloxera are root disease/pests; they are not examples of a rootstock modifying the resistance of the scion as implied here. VSD is a disease of branches.

Line 51 - Ceratocystis is a root disease

Line 60 - 'effect on VSD in the scions of various cocoa rootstocks'

Page 3

Lines 16 - 33 - should give the known resistance of clones to VSD - e.g. S1 has known strong partial resistance to VSD; MCC-01 is known to be susceptible to VSD (its one negative trait). M-05 has some partial resistance to VSD. They have presumably been chosen because of their range of resistant reactions.

Line 38 - 'from the five selected clones' - i.e. the five designated clones

Section 2.2

The genetics of the seedling rootstocks would be different from that of the clonal parents due to open pollination. The correct test of the hypothesis (that rootstocks can influence VSD resistance of scions) would be to use clones as rootstocks (or seed from self-pollinated trees - from controlled hand-pollinations). Clonal rootstocks would be easier. This should be discussed.

Page 4

Line 18 - 'trees' (spelling)

Line 18 - Three replicates (and four trees per plot) is not enough for work with a disease and seedlings as variable as in this situation. You would need a larger plot size (e.g. 8 trees) and at least 5 replicates to have any chance of showing a significant effect.

It is not well explained that there were 5 rootstocks x 5 scion clones = 25 treatments (this only becomes clear in Fig. 1)

Page 5

Lines 26 -49 - evaluation of disease development is vague and would add to the variability in the experiment (see para 1, page 6). It would have been better to measure disease incidence (proportion of plants with any infection, or proportion of branches infected) separately from any attempt to measure disease severity - in fact these were the most useful results given on page 6, e.g. line 13. Measuring time of first symptom appearance would have been useful (see para 1 page 6). Disease severity could have been measured at the end of the experiment by measuring the extent of vascular streaking by splitting infected branches (as done in breeding experiments in PNG (i.e. destructive sampling at the end of the experiment- see Tan, G.Y. (1992). Cocoa breeding in Papua New Guinea and its relevance to pest and disease control. In Cocoa pest and disease management in Southeast Asia and Australasia. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 112. Ed. P.J. Keane and C.A.J. Putter, pp. 117-128, FAO, Rome. & Tan, G.Y. and Tan, W.K. (1987). Genetic variation in resistance to vascular-streak dieback in cocoa. Theoretical and Applied Genetics 75, 761-766.

Pages 6, 7 Results

The results could have been stated much more succinctly by reference to Table 1 and just highlighting the differences. The results show clear differences between the scions in their partial resistance to VSD, in line with previous knowledge about these clones. The results for M-05 are especially important, also for S1 (PBC123) which is an outstanding clones developed in Malaysia, reportedly with some resistance to Black Pod as well.

Table 1 needs a better heading to explain what is meant by 'Infestation' - the contents of the table have to be explained more precisely. I understand the data to be '% incidence of VSD', which I regard as the only reliable measurement of VSD in this experiment (severity could have been measured as the extent of vascular streaking in stems split open after 18 months). The Table is hard to understand and can be set out much more clearly - Column 1 (Scion), Column 2 (Rootstock,) Column 3 (Time of first observation of VSD, months), Column 4 (% VSD incidence 6 months), Column 5 (% VSD incidence 12 months), Column 5 (% VSD incidence 18 months), Column 6 (Mean disease severity 18 months - measured as described on Page 5 - can be explained in footnote to table), Column 7 (mean AUDPC).

Then each of these results for columns 3 to 7 can be analysed by ANOVA and discussed. They should be analysed by factorial ANOVA (Factor 1 - 5 scions), (Factor 2 - 5 rootstocks), with the Interaction effect being especially important (Scion x Rootstock). Factor 1 (scion) would probably be highly significant, Factor 2 probably not significant, and Interaction probably not significant. However, this analysis should be conducted on each of the data columns (3 to 7) and it will be interesting to see the results.

Figure 3 is useful and you could include similar Figures for 'final disease incidence' and 'final disease severity'.

Discussion and conclusion - these could be improved to discuss limitation of the study (replication, method of measuring VSD severity).

Please note that the editorial process varies considerably from journal to journal. To view a sample editorial process, please click here:

http://ees.elsevier.com/eeshelp/sample_editorial_process.pdf

For further assistance, please visit our customer support site at <http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/7923>. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions and learn more about EES via interactive tutorials. You will also find our 24/7 support contact details should you need any further assistance from one of our customer support representatives.



Asman, SP, MP <asman@agri.unhas.ac.id>

Your Submission

1 message

Annals of Agricultural Science <eesserver@eesmail.elsevier.com>
Reply-To: Annals of Agricultural Science <annals_agrsci@agr.asu.edu.eg>
To: asman@agri.unhas.ac.id

Tue, Oct 6, 2020 at 5:14 AM

Ms. Ref. No.: AOAS-D-20-00334R1
Title: Rootstock and scion effects on cocoa resistance to vascular streak dieback
Annals of Agricultural Science

Dear Mr. Asman Asman,

The reviewers have commented on your above paper. They indicated that it is not acceptable for publication in its present form.

However, if you feel that you can suitably address the reviewers' comments (included below), I invite you to revise and resubmit your manuscript.

Please carefully address the issues raised in the comments.

If you are submitting a revised manuscript, please also:

a) outline each change made (point by point) as raised in the reviewer comments

AND/OR

b) provide a suitable rebuttal to each reviewer comment not addressed

To submit your revision, please do the following:

1. Go to: <https://ees.elsevier.com/aoas/>
2. Enter your login details
3. Click [Author Login]
This takes you to the Author Main Menu.
4. Click [Submissions Needing Revision]

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Ali Ali, Ph.D.
Editor in Chief
Annals of Agricultural Science

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #2: This paper reports VSD disease resistance in a number of cocoa clones from Sulawesi, Indonesia. Novelty and importance are highlighted by the finding that VSD resistance is linked to the scion genotype, and not to that of the rootstock, showing that rootstock-systemic induced resistance against VSD is probably non-existent.

Authors have substantially improved the manuscript, based on the comments reviewers raised to the earlier version of the paper. However, many issues need still need to be addressed. They include:

- the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). First of all, did the authors check for normality of the data for all parameters subjected to ANOVA? Although ANOVA is rather robust when applied to non-normal data, e.g. disease incidence is a

proportion (%) parameter, which is bound to the left by 0 % and to the right by 100 %; I wonder whether a generalized linear model (GLM) wouldn't be more appropriate in this case.

- Table 1 reports results of all 25 combinations. As there is no interaction between scion and rootstock, and moreover, 'rootstock' has no significant effect, I would suggest not to report individual rootstock x scion parameter results. The table suggests that the 25 rootstock x scion groups have been subjected to a Tukey test(?). This is not useful, was already criticized in the first version of the paper and has not been addressed (or refuted). Tests of significance of differences should be restricted to parameter averages for the scions (only for that factor a significant result was observed).

- The AUDPC is confusing. Is Yi (line 185) a score per tree? How does Yi relate to the disease severity score I? Is AUDPC a better parameter to assess VSD susceptibility or resistance of cocoa trees or do they assess different things? In such case, which things? The results section reports VSD disease incidence and severity but not the AUDPC-values... why is that? In the Material and Methods section (line 183), it is stated that AUDPC uses the area under the 'disease severity' curve; which is reported in Table 1 and Figure 3; but all of a sudden, there is also Figure 4 reporting 'Mean AUDPC values of VSD incidence'. Furthermore, the AUDPC of VSD severity are already mentioned in Table 1; there is no need to report them a second time in a figure.

- Table 1 further reports VSD incidence scores for months 6, 12 and 18 after planting. The choice of these periods seems to have been done arbitrarily. It is used to illustrate the speed of VSD development in the experimental trees. Just a suggestion: can the authors gather all monthly recorded incidence data into 1 'VSD development speed' parameter? I guess that would be more useful.

- line 178: what does 'scale' mean here? Not clear...

- the results section reports results for each considered clone individually, but why are the results for clone RB lacking?

- the conclusion is just 1 sentence. Whereas I support short, concise conclusions, I guess a couple of more sentences could be added, e.g. on the shortcomings of the study, implications for VSD breeding and/or future research.

- the LANGUAGE: remains a critical problem with this manuscript. Authors will find numerous comments and suggestions for improving it in the attached annotated pdf. However, I have stopped correcting after a couple of pages as there are too many errors. Apart from the latter errors, the poor quality of the english language makes some sentences impossible to understand. This should be addressed.

Reviewer #3: This paper should be published after a few more small changes as listed below -

Line

1 Change title to 'Effect of rootstock and scion on resistance of cocoa clones to vascular streak dieback caused by *Ceratobasidium theobromae*'

17 Change - 'for' to 'on'; 'was using' to 'used'

20 Change to - 'was surrounded by cocoa with severe VSD infestation on the farm'

22 Change to - 'the rootstocks M-05 and S-1 did not significantly reduce VSD incidence or severity on the susceptible scions'

24 Change - 'on whatever the rootstocks types' to 'regardless of the rootstock type'

26 - be consistent in use of 'cacao' or 'cocoa' throughout the paper. Use one or the other but don't swap between them in the one paper

34 Change to 'mature trees. VSD is currently confined ----'

60 Change 'genotypes' to 'genotype'

69 Remove 'out'

73 Remove 'through'

75 Change 'conferring' to 'conferred'

76 Change 'involved in disease resistance on grafting' to 'may be involved in resistance effects linked to grafting'

77 Change 'involves' to 'include'

140 Change to 'after being planted'

241 Remove 'inherited'

243 Change to 'mechanisms may include restriction of the growth of the pathogen in the xylem vessels and/or inhibition of basidiospore germination by exudates ---'

273 - Add 'The use of rootstock seedlings would have increased the variability of the rootstocks and made it more difficult to obtain significant differences between the effects of rootstocks. Future experiments of this type should use clonal rootstocks.'

Table 1 can be improved

Column headings change to 'after planted to 'after planting'

Remove Column 3 and state in the caption to the table 'In all treatments VSD symptoms were first observed 5 months after field planting.'

Add to the Conclusion - 'There was no evidence that the VSD resistance of the rootstock affected VSD incidence or severity in the scion. However, the fact that seedlings derived from open-pollination were used as rootstocks probably increased the variability of the rootstocks, making it more difficult to show significant effects of rootstocks on the scions.'

References

Holderness should be in lower case

Extension Manual should read 'Papua New Guinea Cocoa Extension Manual', PNG Cocoa Coconut Institute, Tavilo, East New Britain Province, Papua New Guinea, 2017, 312 pp.

Please note that the editorial process varies considerably from journal to journal. To view a sample editorial process, please click here:

http://ees.elsevier.com/eeshelp/sample_editorial_process.pdf

For further assistance, please visit our customer support site at <http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/7923>. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions and learn more about EES via interactive tutorials. You will also find our 24/7 support contact details should you need any further assistance from one of our customer support representatives.



Asman, SP, MP <asman@agri.unhas.ac.id>

Your Submission

1 message

Annals of Agricultural Science <em@editorialmanager.com>
Reply-To: Annals of Agricultural Science <annals_agrsci@agr.asu.edu.eg>
To: Asman Asman <asman@agri.unhas.ac.id>

Sat, Nov 7, 2020 at 11:39 PM

Ms. Ref. No.: AOAS-D-20-00334R2
Title: Effect of rootstock and scion on resistance of cocoa clones to vascular streak dieback caused by *Ceratobasidium theobromae*
Annals of Agricultural Sciences

Dear Mr. Asman Asman,

The reviewers have commented on your above paper. They indicated that it is not acceptable for publication in its present form.

However, if you feel that you can suitably address the reviewers' comments (included below), I invite you to revise and resubmit your manuscript.

Please carefully address the issues raised in the comments.

If you are submitting a revised manuscript, please also:

a) outline each change made (point by point) as raised in the reviewer comments

AND/OR

b) provide a suitable rebuttal to each reviewer comment not addressed

To submit your revision, please do the following:

1. Go to: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/aoas/>
2. Enter your login details
3. Click [Author Login]
This takes you to the Author Main Menu.
4. Click [Submissions Needing Revision]

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Ali Ali, Ph.D.
Editor in Chief
Annals of Agricultural Sciences

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #2: This is the third time this paper has been submitted, and I had hoped it would be the final one. Unfortunately, despite the corrections that have been made to the previous version, some issues remain to be addressed. Most importantly the application of clear, scientific and grammatically correct english continues to be a critical flaw. I have done numerous detailed corrections, which authors can find in the attached annotated pdf-file "AOAS-D-20-00334_R2_reviewer_oct 2020.pdf". I believe that if authors manage to address each and everyone of them, the paper can be accepted for publications.

Some more major comments include:

line

257 - I don't understand why M-05 and S-1 provide 'high heritability'. How exactly (which data/results) is this shown? See also line 287 where you talk about 'resistant progenitor (M-05 and S-1)'. Please clarify.

265 - Better explain how the leaf stomata characteristics play a role in VSD resistance.

289 - "This study provides useful resistance characteristics" ? No... your study suggests that VSD-resistance on grafted cocoa trees is linked to certain scion genotypes and that this resistance is robust, i.e. irrespective of the rootstock genotype used.

289 - Why do you need a larger experimental area and more cocoa trees and replications? That is possible of course, but you should explain why...


ANOVA: In my previous comments, I have asked whether ANOVA can be applied on this data, but have not received a good answer. You have three replicate blocks and 4 trees per treatment. Did you consider blocking effects in your experimental model? Parameter disease incidence is a proportion (%) parameter, which is bound to the left by 0 % and to the right by 100 %; I wonder whether a generalized linear model (GLM) wouldn't be more appropriate in this case. In case authors have no clue, they should consult a statistician.

Fig 3 - The caption mentions 'letters above the bars'; they are not there.

Reviewer #3: This is a useful paper with an appropriate outcome.

For further assistance, please visit our customer support site at <http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/7923>. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions and learn more about EM via interactive tutorials. You will also find our 24/7 support contact details should you need any further assistance from one of our customer support representatives.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/aoas/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

 **AOAS-D-20-00334_R2_reviewer_oct 2020.pdf**
1802K



Asman, SP, MP <asman@agri.unhas.ac.id>

Submission Confirmation for AOAS-D-20-00334R3

1 message

Annals of Agricultural Science <em@editorialmanager.com>
Reply-To: Annals of Agricultural Science <annals_agrsci@agr.asu.edu.eg>
To: Asman Asman <asman@agri.unhas.ac.id>

Sun, Nov 29, 2020 at 8:43 PM

Ms. Ref. No.: AOAS-D-20-00334R3

Title: Effect of rootstock and scion on resistance of cocoa clones to vascular streak dieback caused by *Ceratobasidium theobromae*

Annals of Agricultural Sciences

Dear Mr. Asman Asman,

This message is to acknowledge that we have received your revised manuscript for reconsideration for publication in Annals of Agricultural Sciences.

You may check the status of your manuscript by logging into the Editorial Manager as an author at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/aoas/>.

Thank you for submitting your work to Annals of Agricultural Sciences.

Kind regards,

Editorial Manager
Annals of Agricultural Sciences

For further assistance, please visit our customer support site at <http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/7923>. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions and learn more about EM via interactive tutorials. You will also find our 24/7 support contact details should you need any further assistance from one of our customer support representatives.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/aoas/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.



Asman, SP, MP <asman@agri.unhas.ac.id>

Please edit your submission AOAS-D-20-00334R3

1 message

Annals of Agricultural Science <em@editorialmanager.com>
Reply-To: Annals of Agricultural Science <annals_agrsci@agr.asu.edu.eg>
To: Asman Asman <asman@agri.unhas.ac.id>

Tue, Dec 1, 2020 at 11:34 PM

Re: AOAS-D-20-00334R3

Title: Effect of rootstock and scion on resistance of cocoa clones to vascular streak dieback caused by *Ceratobasidium theobromae*

Dear Mr. Asman,

Your submission entitled "Effect of rootstock and scion on resistance of cocoa clones to vascular streak dieback caused by *Ceratobasidium theobromae*" has been received by Annals of Agricultural Sciences.

However, before we can proceed with the review process we ask you to address the following:

You changed the arrangement of Smilja Lambert on the system. re-assign him back.

The same author has no affiliation or institution either on the system or manuscript. Correct this information and modify it on the system and manuscript.

Please log onto Editorial Manager as an Author:

<https://www.editorialmanager.com/aoas/>

1. Go to the menu item "Submissions/Revisions Sent Back to Author".
2. Click "Edit Submission/Revision".
3. Click on the relevant submission step on the left-hand menu;
4. Provide or modify the item/information as requested.
5. Go to "Attach Files" and "Build PDF for my Approval".
6. View and Approve your new PDF file including the changed item(s), or if needed, Edit again.

Thank you for submitting your work to the journal, and if you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Annals of Agricultural Sciences

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/aoas/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.



Asman, SP, MP <asman@agri.unhas.ac.id>

Your Submission

1 message

Annals of Agricultural Science <em@editorialmanager.com>

Sat, Feb 20, 2021 at 6:23 AM

Reply-To: Annals of Agricultural Science <annals_agrsci@agr.asu.edu.eg>

To: Asman Asman <asman@agri.unhas.ac.id>

Ms. Ref. No.: AOAS-D-20-00334R4

Title: Effect of rootstock and scion on resistance of cocoa clones to vascular streak dieback caused by *Ceratobasidium theobromae*

Annals of Agricultural Sciences

Dear Mr. Asman Asman,

I am pleased to inform you that your paper "Effect of rootstock and scion on resistance of cocoa clones to vascular streak dieback caused by *Ceratobasidium theobromae*" has been accepted for publication in Annals of Agricultural Sciences.

Thank you for submitting your work to Annals of Agricultural Sciences.

Your accepted manuscript will now be transferred to our production department and work will begin on creation of the proof. If we need any additional information to create the proof, we will let you know. If not, you will be contacted again in the next few days with a request to approve the proof and to complete a number of online forms that are required for publication.

Yours sincerely,

Ali Ali, Ph.D.
Editor in Chief
Annals of Agricultural Sciences

For further assistance, please visit our customer support site at <http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/7923>. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions and learn more about EM via interactive tutorials. You will also find our 24/7 support contact details should you need any further assistance from one of our customer support representatives.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/aoas/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.



Asman, SP, MP <asman@agri.unhas.ac.id>

Production has begun on your article [AOAS_308] in Annals of Agricultural Sciences1 message

a.chavez@elsevier.com <a.chavez@elsevier.com>
To: asman@agri.unhas.ac.id

Wed, Feb 24, 2021 at 3:21 AM

Our reference: AOAS 308
Article reference: AOAS_AOAS-D-20-00334
Article title: Effect of rootstock and scion on resistance of cocoa clones to vascular streak dieback caused by Ceratobasidium theobromae
To be published in: Annals of Agricultural Sciences

Dear Mr. Asman,

Thank you for choosing to publish in Annals of Agricultural Sciences. Please read this e-mail carefully as it contains important information.

FINALIZE PUBLISHING YOUR ARTICLE:

We work hard to publish our authors' articles online as quickly and efficiently as possible, therefore processing of your accepted manuscript for publication has already begun. To ensure that we publish your article in accordance with your wishes, please now complete the forms found here:

<http://authors.elsevier.com/authorforms/AOAS308/f54357453e1fb405ce1de4bd7b128ff2>

If this link does not work, please copy the entire URL (noting that it may run on to a second line in this message) into your browser. You should log in with your Elsevier Profile credentials, which you may have already created when submitting your article.

CHECK YOUR CONTACT DETAILS:

Please check that your details listed below are correct so we can contact you if needed:

Mr. Asman Asman
Hasanuddin University
Department of Plant Pests and Diseases
Makassar
Indonesia
Phone: not available
Fax: not available
E-mail: asman@agri.unhas.ac.id

YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER:

Lastly, to help us provide you with the best service, please make a note of your article's reference number AOAS 308 and quote it in all of your messages to us.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Kind regards,

Analyn Chavez

Elsevier
E-Mail: a.chavez@elsevier.com

HAVE QUESTIONS OR NEED ASSISTANCE?

For further assistance, please visit our Customer Support site, where you can search for solutions on a range of topics, such as Open Access or payment queries, and find answers to frequently asked questions. You can also talk to our customer support team by phone 24 hours a day from Monday-Friday and 24/7 by live chat and email.

Get started here: <http://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing>

Copyright © 2015 Elsevier B.V. | Privacy Policy <http://www.elsevier.com/privacypolicy>

Elsevier Limited, The Boulevard, Langford Lane, Kidlington, Oxford, OX5 1GB, United Kingdom, Registration No. 1982084