



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

CABI IDENTIFICATION REPORT

Our ref.: YN3/12/H216

Your ref: **Your number** **IMI number** **Identification and comments**

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The authors reply was unsatisfactory. The major revisions I suggested were meant to make the experiments replicable (as requested by the author's guidelines) and to enrich the manuscript. You will find here those comments (in red), with some more explanations (in black): P3 L116: Did you prepare replicates of isolation plates from each tuber? If yes, provide details. If not, explain why. The sentence at L133 gives not details enough: please provide the numbers of replicates. The guidelines for publication require that the authors give experimental details in order to make the experiment replicable. 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? Even if you reckon that it is out of the scope of this paper, please answer the question at least in the comments to the reviewer: 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? Even if the molecular identification was carried out at CABI E-UK, please provide at least the name of the primers. The guidelines for publication require that the authors give experimental details in order to make the experiment replicable. 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. The template provided by the journal website envisages a single section for results&discussion. P4 Table 3: 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). Please add the statistical analysis that supports the comparison between the "no fungal rot" data and the "suffering fungal rot" data. This is an important point, if you want to reach one of the aims of the paper. P4 L165: Clearly state that all the fungi you isolated have been already isolated from yam in previous studies.	Yes . See line 119 of revised manuscript See line 140 The report I received from CABI-EUK does not contain this information Results and Discussion are now merged Columns have been compared in the Tables. This is stated in line 152 Many Thanks for corrections



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

L165 states that “The storage rot fungi isolated during this study are **similar** to those reported previously [7, 8, 9]”, but actually they are the **same** species reported previously. Please modify the sentence.