



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_52604
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOASSAY OF LEMON GRASS ON FUNGI PATHOGEN ASSOCIATED WITH CASSAVA TUBERS ROT IN FARIN GADA MARKET, JOS
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	<p>The manuscript was well written. It contains new scientific findings that could possibility add to the available knowledge with respect to disease management of crops. However, the manuscript still contain few writing errors here and there, poor usage of punctuation marks.</p> <p>The author shorten species as 'spp' in some places and as 'sp' in few places, they need to check the entire manuscript to correct. Similarly, 'fungi isolates' was written in place of 'fungal isolates' in the entire manuscript.</p> <p><i>Aspergillus flavus</i> appears more than 10 times in the entire manuscript. Could be written as <i>A. flavus</i> in other places. Similarly with other scientific names used in the entire manuscript.</p> <p>In overall, I will recommend the manuscript for acceptance following major revision by the authors.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript was well written. It contains new scientific findings that could possibility add to the available knowledge with respect to disease management of crops.</p> <p>However, the manuscript still contain few writing errors here and there, poor usage of punctuation marks.</p> <p>The author shorten species as 'spp' in some places and as 'sp' in few places, they need to check the entire manuscript to correct. Similarly, 'fungi isolates' was written in place of 'fungal isolates' in the entire manuscript.</p> <p><i>Aspergillus flavus</i> appears more than 10 times in the entire manuscript. Could be written as <i>A. flavus</i> in other places. Similarly with other scientific names used in the entire manuscript.</p> <p>In overall, I will recommend the manuscript for acceptance following major revision by the authors.</p> <p>Specific Comments</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>L9: Replace 'effect' with 'effects' – plural. Also, not just a single pathogen was involved hence rewrite 'fungal pathogen' as 'fungal pathogens'</p> <p>L11: Rotten and healthy cassava tubers, I guess?? Please indicate which cassava plant parts were collected? Cassava stems, or tubers????</p> <p>L12: Also here, similar as L11</p> <p>L13: Replace potato dextrose Agar with Potato Dextrose Agar</p> <p>L16: least significant difference replave with Least Significant Difference (LSD)</p> <p>L21: It should 5th day, not 5th day</p> <p>L22: The length of deterioration showed significantly different. Please rewrite this sentence.</p>	



	<p>L23: Replace 'fungi isolates' with 'fungal isolates'</p> <p>Keywords</p> <p>L25: It has been advised that Authors should not use the same words as the title in the keywords as to ensure better accessibility of the article during online search.</p> <p>In lieu of this, I will recommend that the following keywords be replaced - cassava, lemon grass, fungi, rot, tubers</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>L43-45: Please re-write this sentence to enhance readability Different studies has shown fungi from rotted cassava tubers and root after re-inoculation in storage included <i>Fusarium solani</i>, <i>Rhizopus stolonifera</i>, <i>Phytophthora drechslera</i>, <i>Aspergillus niger</i> and <i>Botryodiplodia theobromae</i></p> <p>L44: Replace 're-innoculation' with 're-inoculation'</p> <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>L56: Rotten cassava tuber (50) were collected separate sellers from Farin gada market, Jos. It appears a word or two might be missing in this sentence</p> <p>Replace tuber with tubers</p> <p>'...were collected from different sellers in Farin gada market, Jos.' should read better than 'were collected separate sellers from Farin gada market, Jos'</p> <p>L58: Should be 'lemon grass leaves' not 'leaf'</p> <p>L61-62: The authors wrote "Small portion of diseased cassava tubers were picked under aseptic conditions using sterile scissors and sterilized by dipping inside 70 % ethanol for 5 minutes."</p> <p>I was just wondering if the sterilized part was rinsed in sterile distilled water after dipping in ethanol for five minutes, as this is the standard procedure for sterilization for subsequent incubation. This procedure was never mentioned anywhere in the text.</p> <p>L69-70: Please rewrite this statement 'A small portion of freshly grown colony were picked from the plate using a sterile inoculating needle into a glass slide.' as 'A small portion of freshly grown colony were picked from the plate into a glass slide using a sterile inoculating needle.'</p> <p>L77: Replace 'dirty' with 'dirts'</p> <p>L78: Should be 'dried plant leaves' not 'leaf'</p> <p>L78: Replace were 'pulverizing' using WITH were 'pulverized' using</p> <p>L85: Apparently???</p> <p>L88-89: The inoculated tubers and the control (inoculated)?? Guess the authors intended</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>to write uninoculated control</p> <p>L96: solidity?? Better write as 'allowed to solidify'</p> <p>L102: Replace 'was' with 'were'</p> <p>L114: Replace 'fungi isolates' with 'fungal isolates'</p> <p>L116: Incomplete statement 'This in agreement with the study...'</p> <p>L118: Replace 'fungi isolates' with 'fungal isolates'</p> <p>L121: Also here, replace 'fungi isolates' with 'fungal isolates'</p> <p>L126: add 'in' after reduction, should be 'showed reduction in radial growth'</p> <p>Same L126: should be written as 'Table 4' not 'table 4'</p> <p>L131: Also here again, an incomplete statement 'This similar with the study of...'</p> <p>L140: Should be 'plant extracts' not 'extract' – plural</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>L196-197: Please re-write this sentence to enhance readability - This study revealed that the most fungi are associated with cassava rot in Farin Gada market were <i>Fusarium</i> spp, <i>Penicillium</i> spp, <i>Aspergillus flavus</i>, and <i>Geotrichum candidum</i>.</p> <p>L197-198: '...the highest concentration (20 mL)' - the highest concentration (20 mL) OF WHAT? Plant extracts?</p> <p>L198-199: The finding showed that fungal isolates are responsible for causing deterioration. – I am not sure this should be included in the conclusion section, as this is a widely KNOWN FACT. Please, delete this statement or otherwise rewrite. Make the statement more specific with respect to your research findings.</p> <p>L201: Replace 'the' with 'The'</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>L204: 'Studies' not 'study'</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I highlighted the specific comments in the attached document</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bamisope Steve, Bamisile
Department, University & Country	Fujian Agriculture and Forestry University, China