



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_51112
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenotypic characterization and Molecular phylogenetic relationship of Erysiphe necator infecting grapes
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The article entitled, "Phenotypic characterization and Molecular phylogenetic relationship of <i>Erysiphe necator</i> infecting grapes". The research work and findings in the manuscripts are new. Results are properly presented and discussed very efficiently in the manuscript. I recommend this manuscript for publication after minor revision.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the manuscript title the full plant authority should be mentioned when discussing about the plant material. In this regard, in each case that you aim to discuss about your plant, it should be reported for example as: <i>Borago officinalis</i> L. (not <i>Borago officinalis</i>). 3. Follow the pattern references according to journal pattern. 4. Many typographical, grammar or syntax errors seen in the manuscript may be revised. 5. Results and discussion should be separate. 6. See the attached file for more comments. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The article entitled, "Phenotypic characterization and Molecular phylogenetic relationship of <i>Erysiphe necator</i> infecting grapes". The research work and findings in the manuscripts are new. Results are properly presented and discussed very efficiently in the manuscript. I recommend this manuscript for publication after minor revision.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the manuscript title the full plant authority should be mentioned when discussing about the plant material. In this regard, in each case that you aim to discuss about your plant, it should be reported for example as: <i>Borago officinalis</i> L. (not <i>Borago officinalis</i>). 3. Follow the pattern references according to journal pattern. 4. Many typographical, grammar or syntax errors seen in the manuscript may be revised. 5. Results and discussion should be separate. 6. See the attached file for more comments. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The article entitled, "Phenotypic characterization and Molecular phylogenetic relationship of <i>Erysiphe necator</i> infecting grapes". The research work and findings in the manuscripts are new. Results are properly presented and discussed very efficiently in the manuscript. I recommend this manuscript for publication after minor revision.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the manuscript title the full plant authority should be mentioned when discussing about the plant material. In this regard, in each case that you aim to discuss about your plant, it should be reported for example as: <i>Borago officinalis</i> L. (not <i>Borago officinalis</i>). 3. Follow the pattern references according to journal pattern. 4. Many typographical, grammar or syntax errors seen in the manuscript may be revised. 5. Results and discussion should be separate. 6. See the attached file for more comments. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> No	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	R K Lal
Department, University & Country	Central Institute of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants, India