



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_11180
Title of the Manuscript:	Incidence of <i>Lasiodiplodia theobromae</i> and other fungi from <i>Cola nitida</i> and <i>Cola accuminata</i> in Nigeria
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript presented a sound research work which may increase present knowledge on the subject of rotting kolanut at storage. Little corrections/suggestions must be done before publicizing the article: 1. There is no explanation on how the fungi species were identified (e.g. based on morphological or other features) 2. Line 89 – instead of 2×10^5 should be 2×10^5. 3. Line 123 – “Curvularia” must be italicized. 4. Line 140 – “f. pallidroseum” “f” must be capitalized. 5. References are very poor, needs update as only old reports are cited. Are there other new articles on the subject? If not, it should be mentioned, explained why.	I agreed. Ms corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I think the title should refer to kolanut, since the association of fungi was specifically to this organ. Line 37 – the text “These fungi ...” is not clear as to which fungi are they referring, as the statement is dealing with <i>Lasiodiplodia theobromae</i>. Lack of text on lines 125 thru 136. Text on lines 178 thru 180 is repeated on lines 182 thru 184. Line 200 – citation of Edkert 1972 does not match with Ekert, 1972 on the references.	I agreed. Ms corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It seems that there are not many researches done on the subject of kolanut storage rot, therefore it wise to emphasize that the introduction. A statement on the economic, social and human healthy (if that is the case) on the problem. As I have been working with <i>Lasiodiplodia theobromae</i> for decades, I wonder if they do not have difficulties on sporulation of some isolates of this fungus.	Few research works were reported on kolanuts despite its economic, social and human healthy .