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	**Line 28 to 46**// Where did you inspire for the **Methods**? From literature? Please indicate an author. How did you collect the data? No statistical analysis? It must be described in Material and Method Look like interesting result, but the statistical analysis is no described. It's interesting to show the different by using posterior test! Poorest discussion! It must be documented	**Line 28 to 46**// Where did you inspire for the **Methods**? From literature? Please indicate an author. The use of culture medium to produce huge amounts of spores are known in the science community and the variation in the quantities of the ingredient as well. We opted to use tomato as a substrate because the pathogen are related to this host. We did not follow or get inspired by any author. That is the reason why we write the method and procedure in details. How did you collect the data? No statistical analysis? It must be described in Material and Method **It was done as suggested by the reviewer. The modification is highlighted in yellow.** Look like interesting result, but the statistical analysis is no described. It's interesting to show the different by using posterior test! **It was done as suggested by the reviewer. The modification is highlighted in yellow** Poorest discussion! It must be documented **It was done as suggested by the reviewer and the discussion was improved.**
Minor REVISION comments		
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)*	