



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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	P1 L44: add a bibliographic reference about the socio-cultural importance of yam. P1 L51: cite Acholo et al., 1997 <i>Microbiological research</i> about the importance of insects in yam rots. P2 L60: cite also Aboagye-Nuamah et al., 2005 <i>Annals of Applied Biology</i>. P3 L 106: add a bibliographic reference about the 7-point hedonic scale that you used. P3 L116: Did you prepare replicates of isolation plates from each tuber? If yes, provide details. If not, explain why. P3 L118: Did you isolated only 7 fungal species? Provide details here or in the result section (P3 L137): how many isolates did you get? Which percentage was pathogenic? P3 L121: Provide details for the molecular identification of the isolates: primer names and sequences, date of BLAST search. Were the sequences deposited in GenBank? P3-4-5: Since the results are very concise and the discussion section present many results, I suggest to present results and discussion in a single section of the manuscript.	Citation [1] is added Citation [5], 2003 is a review and covers all aspects of yam spoilage Needless. Citations [7, 8, 9], 2000, 2008 and 2012 respectively, are adequate Citation [13] is added Line 133 explains that appropriate replicates were used in all the experiments Outside scope and objectives of present study. Molecular identification was carried out at CABI E-UK. Manuscript was prepared



SDI Review Form 1.6

	P4 Table 3: The table represents the weight loss at the end of shelf life of yam tubers. Why did you choose the end of shelf life (i.e. the point of the hedonic scale corresponding to unacceptability of the yam meals)? The statistical analysis of the data is intended to highlight the differences among the varieties of yam. On the other hand, the authors aimed to “determine the influence of fungal rot on post-harvest storage losses” (P2 L66). With this purpose, the data “no fungal rot” and “suffering fungal rot” should be compared within each species (i.e.: perform the statistics on the column also, not only on the row). P4 L165: Clearly state that all the fungi you isolated have been already isolated from yam in previous studies. P5 L 197: On the basis of your data and of literature data, would you be able to suggest a “best variety” for storage, among those studied? Please enrich the discussion section.	according to BMRJ Template Yam loses moisture and undergoes physiological changes during storage. However, it may still be used as food and therefore, not lost, at least, technically until end of shelf life. Line 165 is sufficiently clear Line 204 is added
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	P1 L9: substitute “to determine under condition” with “to determine, under condition”. P1 L23: substitute “predominantly, dry rots during” with “predominantly dry rots, during”. P2 L57: substitute “caused by among other” with “caused by, among other” P2 L58: uncorrect spell of “Muccor” which should be “Mucor”. P2 L74-78: check the use of comma and inverted commas because some are lacking. P2 L77-78: I suggest changing the sentence as follows “The interior of the tuber of <i>Discorea rotundata</i>, also called “Guinea yam” or “white yam”, is typically white, with firm texture”. P4 L178: I suggest modifying the sentence as follows: “The <i>D. dumentorum</i> and the <i>D. alata</i> species, particularly var. “abana mmei”, suffered the highest....”	Disagree Disagree Sentence, recast Done Done Sentence, recast Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The aims of this paper are clearly stated: the authors are interested in isolating rot fungi from stored yam roots, and they also aim at investigating the impact of those fungi on the post-harvest losses of the roots. The first activity (fungal isolation) confirmed previous results. It is not clear whether the authors isolated species other than those cited in table 1 and whether they isolated only the cited species from each yam variety (i.e. maximum two species per variety?). The second aim is reached by comparing the shelf life and the weight losses of the different varieties, under fungal rot or self-spoilage. The time-point (end of shelf life) selected to collect the data (see table 3) represents a time-point in which the yam is not usable anymore. Wouldn't be more interesting to evaluate the losses at a time-point in which the yam is still edible and hence has still a commercial value? It would be interesting for evaluating the importance of developing new storage techniques, as the authors envisage in the conclusion section. If the authors possess the weight data collected along the experiment, I suggest presenting a time course graph, from start to end of shelf life, indicating also the point of acceptability of the yam to consumers and the corresponding losses, due to auto-spoilage or to fungal rot. The authors presented few results. The isolation of fungi apparently lack of replicates (or at least it is not clearly stated). The evaluation of shelf-life	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and weight loss, by contrast, is robust. The discussion could be enriched.	
--	--	--