



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_BMRJ_16836
Title of the Manuscript:	Field and <i>in-vitro</i> studies on <i>Corynespora</i> leaf fall disease of <i>Hevea brasiliensis</i> in Nigeria.
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The paper describes a simple study on leaf fall disease of rubber trees caused by <i>Corynespora</i> sp. under natural conditions in Nigeria. The study has been conducted in correct manner. The paper is generally well-written and easy to follow. The technical details were edited carefully and only minor flaws could be found in the manuscript that should be corrected/addressed (see below). The Introduction is compact but giving enough information on the background for the research done. Materials and methods are extensively described and allow for repetition of all experiments, with all necessary references cited. Also statistical analyses raise no major questions concerning their significance. My only doubt is that little was written concerning the isolation of individual pathogenic strains that have been used for growth speed analysis (Table 3). I would recommend adding a paragraph on isolation of fungal strains and their species identification. Results and Discussion section presents data in an organized way. However, In Tables 3 and 4 and also in the text (Line 85) appears an isolate NIG 805 which I could not find in Tables 1 and 2. The calculation formula for disease index should be moved to the Materials and methods section. The standard deviations of biomass amounts (Line 93, Table 4) seem really large and in my opinion it should be discussed. The statement in Lines 112-113 is not valid. The	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	aggressiveness should be evaluated on the basis of artificial infection tests as it is NOT a direct consequence of fast growth and large biomass production. Please, rephrase the sentence. Also the next sentence (Lines 113-114) is not supported by any data obtained. The Authors can use the reference for discussion but clearly stating that no expression experiments have been conducted during present study.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Poland