



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
In my opinion, the figure descriptions are still incomplete. I would suggest adding more details to the figure descriptions before publication. For example: Fig. 1: Host genotype interaction with <i>H. vastatrix</i> isolates. The means and the SE or SD? represented by the bars marked with the same letters are not significantly different at $p=0.05$ according to the results of ANOVA and the post-hoc Student-Newman Keuls test. Or Fig. 2: Comparative general virulence of <i>H. vastatrix</i> isolates against nine coffee genotypes. The bars represent the means and SE or SD? for $n= ?$ Means marked with the same letter were not significantly different at $p=0.05$ according to... Minor suggestions: Lane 102: "The data was subjected to analysis..." I would say: The data were subjected to analysis... Fig. 3, lane 151: "The genotype legend is arranged in the same order the bars appear in the figure." I would say: The genotype legend is arranged in the same order as the bars appear in the figure. (I am not sure, English is not my native language. Plate 1: Lane 155: "Experimental layout and interaction of CLR pathogen isolates with coffee genotypes.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	University of Gdańsk, Poland