



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2012_IJPSS_2772
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors involved in the early events of spore germination and host colonization by <i>Botrytis cinerea</i>

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>Some issues raised in the first review have still not been addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abbreviations need to be defined at first use, e.g. "SDW". See p. 2, line 93. In the authors' response to comment 4 in first review, they mention a previously published investigation. Citation should be given and results compared with those of the current study. The authors say they have revised the mislabeled X-axes in Figs. 7 and 8, however I see no change and the labeling still does not make sense. Maybe there is confusion about μM, mM and M? With respect to comment 6 in first review about effects of sugars not being consistent with conclusions reached, it is necessary to also change sentence on p. 5, line 282. With respect to authors response to comment 7, it is still not clear why different media were used. If there is good reason to use different media in the various experiments this should be described in the paper. Decision whether to include Figs. 2, 4 and 6 perhaps should be made by the editor. In my view, they do not add any information not already presented in graphs. The authors say they have updated information about preparation of bean leaf medium in the Methods but I do not see a change in the manuscript. P. 2, line 73 correct spelling of Phaseolus. <p>Review attached. It is strange that there are several instances where the authors say they have made corrections but the revised manuscript does not show corresponding changes. Is it possible that they made a mistake in resubmitting a wrong version?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Done. , also for the comment of <i>B. cinerea</i> vs. <i>Botrytis cinerea</i>. Our last comment were overlapped with other comment. The spore concentration 2.5×10^4 spore/ml was a concentration standardized thought most experiments. With that cation effect experiment we agreed to set the concentration at 1×10^3 Spore/ml . We tried in the lab several times before this test and this concentration proved to be the minimum concentration effective for getting response of conidia in the salt cation. It is a whole separate experiment exclusive of other treatments. The labelling is exactly the concentration used, starting from $1 \mu\text{M}$ up to 10mM. Ten fold of $1 \mu\text{M}$ is $10 \mu\text{M}$. Ten fold of $10 \mu\text{M}$ is $100 \mu\text{M}$. Ten fold of $100 \mu\text{M}$ is 1mM ($=1000 \mu\text{M}$). Ten fold of 1mM is 10mM ($=10000 \mu\text{M}$). This is why we briefed the display of digits on the axis. Line 280-283 P5 states: "Generally, <i>B. cinerea</i> is classified among acidic fungi (Prusky and Yakoby, 2003) and similar to other pathogenic fungi, such as <i>Penicillium expansum</i>, <i>P. digitatum</i>, <i>P. italicum</i>, and <i>Sclerotinia sclerotiorum</i> that use tissue acidification in their attack (Vautard and Fevre, 2003)." There is no mention to the sugars or conclusions about sugars in this line. Do you mean P5 Line 292? Again , there is no specific reason for the different media used, Media and concentrations were decided according to preliminary unpublished data to fine tune procedure. Although we like to keep them, we will welcome your final decision. The change in the manuscript was done line 81, 150. Done, thanks <p>Please for any further comments that you see still missing , we are here to review again, we are sorry if we missed any note.</p>