Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAHR_46015**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Culture medium based on tomato leaves for abundant production of conidia from Septoria lycopersici**
Type of the Article	**Short 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	The paper is important because it provides information for the multiplication of spores of Septoria lycopersici, fundamental for the research on methods of control of this fungic agent in tomato The objective of work is clear and precise The materials and methods are poorly developed does not present the experimental design nor the methodology for the analysis of the results The results are clearly presented as well as the statistical analysis used. Materials and methods should be included in the number of repetitions per treatment and analysis methodology. There is no discussion of results and the conclusions are extremely poor	The paper is important because it provides information for the multiplication of spores of Septoria lycopersici, fundamental for the research on methods of control of this fungic agent in tomato The objective of work is clear and precise The materials and methods are poorly developed does not present the experimental design nor the methodology for the analysis of the results **It was done as suggested by the reviewer. The modification is highlighted in yellow.** The results are clearly presented as well as the statistical analysis used. Materials and methods should be included in the number of repetitions per treatment and analysis methodology. **It was done as suggested by the reviewer. The modification is highlighted in yellow.** There is no discussion of results and the conclusions are extremely poor **It was done as suggested by the reviewer and the discussion and conclusion were improved.** The research generated important information which is poorly developed in the paper. the discussion of the presented results is missing and the conclusions are extended. The bibliographic review is very poor **The bibliographic review was improved as suggested. The modification is highlighted in yellow.**
Minor REVISION comments	The research generated important information which is poorly developed in the paper. the discussion of the presented results is missing and the conclusions are extended. The bibliographic review is very poor	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	