



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_29841
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of cultural and morphometric characters of Fusarium xylarioides strains isolated from Coffee trees infected with Coffee Wilt Disease collected in Eastern, North Kivu and Equateur Provinces, Democratic Republic of Congo
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	ABSTRACT The highlighted word should be replaced with from Place and duration of study- Delete highlighted word Methodology - Replace highlighted word with from as in above Result - Replaced the highlighted word with an INTRODUCTION Line 18 - Remove the highlighted word Line 31- Studies instead of studied Line 40 : Replace highlighted word with from MATERIALS AND METHODS Line 56 – 67 Media preparation should be discussed under a different sub heading and not under Macroscopic Characterization Line 68- Recast to make meaning Line 89 – Cross check spelling of the highlighted word and we completed should be written Production of subcultures were completed by Line 90- 92 Statement too long, punctuate where necessary Line 106- 108 Cross check statement and recast to make meaning	Abstract In was replaced by from Place and duration: of was deleted Methodology: in was replaced by from Result: on was replaced by an Introduction Line 18: of was removed Line 38: studied was replaced by studies Line 40: in was replaced by from Materials and methods Line 56-67 has been discussed under sub heading Preparation of culture medium used Line 68 was recast (see line 69-71) Line 89: revivification was changed to revitalization, the highlighted word was changed. Line 90 – 92 was modified (see line 91-93). Line 106-108 was recast (see line 107 – 108). Results Line 118-112 was modified (see line 119 – 122).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	RESULT Line 118 – 122 should be reported more scientifically. Line 130- 132 Authors should recast to make sense. Line 178- 180 – use necessary punctuation Line 187- Replace the highlighted word with The present study. Do same in places with similar situation. DISCUSSION Figure 1 should be represented with an alternative pattern for easy understanding as everything is crowded. Authors should endeavour to compare their work with recent findings. REFERENCES References are too old, authors should check for current references.	Line 130-132 was recast (see 130 – 131). Line 178 -180 was modified, a punctuation was added (see line 179 – 180). Line 187: Our results was replaced by The present study (see line 188). The same modification was done in similar situation. Discussion Figure 1: is well represented. If is in color the curve of each strain is well differentiated. The present work was compared with other findings. References Other references were added. Most of the recent work refer to articles (former) we cited, and few of these recent works were referred to the description of Fusarium strains. Those based on this description are former works that have been made.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are a lot of grammatical errors, authors should correct them	The text has been made to correct grammatical errors.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		