



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_50098
Title of the Manuscript:	Fungi associated with major agricultural and forage crops in integrated systems of tropical regions
Type of the Article	Review 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>In the present form, the manuscript looks senseless, since it does not include any specific information. Now it represents a brief description of several fungi, their potential hosts, and measures used to control them. This information can be easily found in any books or textbooks or specialized websites without need to read 88 references. Moreover, this manuscript, if published, will never be cited because of the lack of detailed information that would be useful for those who study these pathogenic fungi.</p> <p>I strongly recommend authors to add some analytics into the manuscript. At least two suggestions:</p> <p>First, if you analyzed a large number of papers dedicated to the occurrence and control of fungal pathogens in tropic region, then you could describe geographical occurrence of these fungi in different tropical regions. One fungus can be crucial in Africa, whereas another one is important for any of South American countries... You could aggregate such data into a table, which would be useful in future for other researchers.</p> <p>Second, if you took a 20-year period for review, then you could track any temporal changes in the occurrence of target fungi in different regions and yield losses caused by them.</p>	<p>We appreciate the contributions. However, we disagree with the assertion regarding the relevance of the paper.</p> <p>The notes were corrected as the reviewer requested.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract it is necessary to explain abbreviations used (ICL, ICLF) the first time when they were appeared. You did it in the introduction, but you should do it in the Abstract too. I suggest it should be ICLS instead of ICL.</p> <p>Methodology Lines 52-54: the phrase about publications prior 1999 looks like you excluded only those old publications (1999 and earlier), which did not meet your criteria; in this case, it looks like you included those old publication, which corresponded to your criteria that contradicts to the first phrase of the paragraph. Please, re-phrase.</p>	<p>The notes were corrected as the reviewer requested. We appreciate the contributions.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Some language improvement would be desired. For example, there are some excessive "the" in the text.</p>	<p>There was a grammatical correction of the entire manuscript by specialized company.</p> <p>We appreciate the contributions.</p>

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	We appreciate the contributions.