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	**The abstract was poorly written, methodology and conclusion not too good**	Disagree
Minor REVISION comments	The report should be synchronised with the topic with a little tune up in the introduction	Disagree
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is okay and its contribution to knowledge cannot be ruled out	Agree