



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_BMRJ_16968
Title of the Manuscript:	Variation in Pathogenicity of <i>Hemileia vastatrix</i> Isolates Collected in Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The study provides important data on coffee resistance to coffee leaf rust (CLR) fungal pathogen races in Kenya. The experimental data are presented clearly, with adequate statistical treatment, and appropriate conclusions are driven. However, I have some comments on the manuscript. comments: 1/ In Materials and methods, scoring of plant resistance is explained. however, I have not found any analogous information on scoring virulence of the pathogen as shown in Figure 2. The methodology of the assessment of the pathogen virulence has to be added to Materials and methods. 2/ Figure 1 is just an illustration of a relatively poor quality. I miss a clear description of all samples shown in the figure. All samples shown in the figure should be adequately described and they should also be of the same size (other type of photograph should be used).	Thank you The method used to score resistance is the same used to score pathogen virulence since one is a counter reaction of the other. Both data are therefore generated by the same method but can be presented differently to achieve the objectives. To address this comment, we have adequately described these materials in table 2. This is to avoid too much detail in the figure. However, these samples are coffee genotypes which are well known and documented with the names used. Some are commercial cultivars while others are parents of these commercial cultivars.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Formal comments: Abstract, line 2: Insert "a" before the words "rapid break down", i.e., "a rapid break down" Abstract, line 15: Insert "a" before the words "significant variation", i.e., "a significant variation"	These typographical/grammatical errors have been corrected as required



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Material and methods, line 63: Insert “a” before the words “high level”, i.e., “a high level of CLR infection.” Results, line 126: Insert a comma before and after the word “respectively” Line 133: Correct the word “on” to “in” in the sentence “..to play any role in the virulence of the isolates.” Line 140: Insert “a” before the words “significant (p<0.05) interaction”, i.e., “a significant (p<0.05) interaction” Discussion, line 159: Insert “a” before the words “different interaction - you should also write “a differential interaction between the genotypes” Line 172: Insert a comma after the words “Besides these SH genes,...” Line 178: Insert a comma before the word “especially” Line 188: Insert “a” before the words “significant diversity”, i.e., “a significant diversity” Line 193: Insert “a” before the words “continued interaction, i.e., “a continued interaction”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		