



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Microbiology Research Journal International</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The "Intrudaction" section is focused just on the cassava. A part regarding lemongrass is strongly need. Plant description, applications, chemical constituents etc. Also, there is no aim of work given.</li> <li>2. The 2.5 section regarding preparation of lemongrass extracts is very poorly written. More details are needed. Amount of used material, specific conditions of process, like heating temperature, etc. This is crucial for the authenticity of this work.</li> <li>3. Why "pathogenicity test" was carried out? I do not see the context. I think that author just made this test and added the results to have more content in manuscript. I suggest to remove this part, or give the information what is it for.</li> <li>4. 2.7 section is a mess. I totally do not understand if Authors think about o concentration, of volume of extracts. It is very chaotic.</li> <li>5. Authors state that they isolated 22 species of fungi, but they named just 4. What about rest? Where are the descriptions etc?</li> <li>6. Table 22 and Table 3 are not mentioned in the text of manuscript.</li> <li>7. Authors had examined the lemongrass extracts in vitro. There were no test run out in vivo. We have just a clue, that lemongrass extract may be worthy for preserving cassava, but the next experiment is needed, to confirm that this extract will actually work while storage. Moreover, I am really worried about a novelty of this work. There are many reports including in vitro activity of lemongrass extracts against pointed fungi. Authors should add some comments to defend the novelty of their work.</li> </ol> <p><b>All my detailed comments are given in the pdf file with manuscript</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	A lot of unclear sentences and paragraphs. Also some spelling problems. All detailed comments are given in pdf file.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>In my opinion at this moment this manuscript should be rejected. It needs a lot of improvement, and probably crucial corrections. Author prepared a sloppy manuscript, with a big mess in "Materials and Methods" part, what makes the presented results questionable.</p> <p>All my comments are given in manuscript pdf. file.</p>	

**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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jacek Łyczko</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wrocław University of Environmental and Life Sciences, Poland</b>