SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Microbiology Research Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BMRJ_7121**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Fungi associated with post-harvest storage losses in some Nigerian varieties of Dioscorea species**
Type of the 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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Although, the manuscript describes fungi associated with post-harvest storage losses in some Nigerian varieties of *Dioscorea* species; is not a very new study. A lot of studies have already been published as discussed by authors also but rotting of *Dioscorea* with different fungi is itself an important study form consumer's health point of view. Moreover, the manuscript is well written, with adequate review of literature, well planned material and methods, results are well presented and discussed with previous literature. Hence can be accepted for publication. Rest the final decision will be of editor in chief.	Agree with Reviewer