



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	I much concern the experiment designing. The authors conducted a control experiment. Generally, the pathogens from naturally infested should selected to inoculate the selected yam varieties. However, the authors only select one barn for the experiment. Different bars could have different pathogens. The other concerns is that the fungal identification. The authors stated that those fungal identification were confirm by the world well known services. However, the <i>A. flavus</i> is doubt because the ITS sequence is identity to <i>A. oryzae</i>. All the varietie name such "adaka", "abi" should be italic.	experimental is added to line 87. Authors wanted all varieties of yams stored under similar conditions for comparison purposes Line 141 – 143 of manuscript states as follows <i>"Aspergillus flavus</i> shared 100% identity to multiple ITS sequences also reported from <i>Aspergillus oryzae</i>. This isolate was distinguished from <i>A. oryzae</i> on the basis of its smaller conidia (up to 6µm, whereas those of <i>A. oryzae</i> are larger, up to 8µm)." This is part of the report by CABI and I consider it adequate. The use of inverted commas as in "adaka" is to avoid confusion with Binomial convention of nomenclature. Variety names are not italicized.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		