



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_37720
Title of the Manuscript:	FUNGITOXIC POTENTIALS OF EXTRACTS OF PLANT ORIGIN AGAINST FUGAL ROOT ROT OF CASSAVA ( <i>Manihot esculenta</i> Crantz) IN STORAGE
Type of the 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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Line 69: change rotted to rotten  Line 74: Change " Peathogenicity " to Pathogenicity  Line 77 and 78: State the method/materials used for pathogen identification  Line 82: Drying of leaves at a temperature of 60°C for 24 hours will denature the biological active ingredient in the leaves, air drying at room temperature should be used.  Line 83: Change "ground" to milled</p> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b></p> <p>Commercial or synthetic fungicide such as mancozeb should be used as positive control</p> <p><b>RESULTS</b></p> <p>Analyze result in the tables using Duncan Multiple Range Test; separate the means using Duncan letters. Standard Error should also be included, example 82.00±13.15</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION</b></p> <p>Page 198-200: The author stated that all the pathogenic organisms isolated in this work have been previously isolated /reported by many authors. Could the author be more explicit in stating his contribution to knowledge and the uniqueness of this article with respect to the isolated pathogens?</p>	<p>Line 69 changed  Line 74 changed  Line 77 and 78 Reference to fungal Atlas by Sangoyomi (2004; 2010).  Line 82 changed  Line 83 changed</p> <p><b>MATERIALSAND METHODS</b></p> <p>The efficacy of extracts of plant origin as alternative to synthetic fungicides was investigated and the control experiments were treated with the extracting solvents. The synthetic fungicide was not used to avoid possible residual effects. Also, the fungicide is not only scarce but expensive for the resource poor farmers who are likely to benefit from the work. The plant materials used are readily available and the extract preparation requires no special skill.</p> <p><b>RESULT</b></p> <p>The standard error is included. Least Significant Difference (LSD) at 5% level of probability, standard mean separation apparatus was used to separate the means which is so indicated in each table.</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION</b></p> <p>Lines 198-200: This has been incorporated.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		