



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 aim of the study was to verify the status of resistance to Coffee Leaf Rust (caused by <i>Hemileia vastatrix</i> Berk and Broome) among Kenyan <i>Coffea</i> cultivars. In this study, nine CLR isolates were used to test/estimate their infection score (based on the sporulation rate) depending on the host coffee genotype. It was demonstrated that Robutsa derivatives are still resistant to most races of <i>H. vastatrix</i> in Kenya. The CLR isolates showed some differences in their virulence, which could be dependent on the host coffee genotype. In my opinion, these data could be valuable. However, the author/s has/have not identified any putative virulence factors present in the tested CLR isolates or the host resistance genes (the SH genes). Due to the lack of molecular elements in this study, I would suggest to change the title of the paper and re-build some conclusions. The figure legends also should be more precisely described (i.e. with statistical indicators, Fig. 3). What is a difference between the Figures, 2 and 3? The Fig. 3, Table 3 and Plate 1 show the same result, the same experiment. Is it possible to create/produce from them one consistent figure and one figure legend? There are not ethical issues in this manuscript.	The title has been changed to "Status of Coffee Leaf Rust Resistance on Kenyan Commercial Resistant Cultivars" The statistical indicators were avoided in fig. 3 because the figure was meant to depict the interaction between CLR pathogen Isolates and the Genotypes i.e. to show whether different genotypes responded in a similar or different way to different isolates. It was not meant to compare different genotypes or different isolates hence no need of statistical indicators. Only the ANOVA can show whether the interaction was significant. Figure 3, Table 3 and Plate 1 show partly same



SDI Review Form 1.6

		information. We have therefore agreed to remove table 3. However, we would like to retain plate 1 since the plate also shows at a glance the experimental layout apart from host pathogen interaction.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		