



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 <i>Fusarium xylarioides</i> 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	In this manuscript, the author detailedly studied cultural and morphometric characters of <i>Fusarium xylarioides</i> strains from Eastern, North Kivu and Equateur Provinces, Democratic Republic of Congo. The work is very well, but the author should explain the following question. 1. The author described the morphometric characters of <i>Fusarium xylarioides</i> strains from different places. But the author did not describe the relationships between the size, conidia and the different places, and also did not explain the reasons to produce the difference. I think this is important to control the coffee wilt diseases. 2. The plasticity and diversity are very common for the strains from different places, it is not inappropriate that the author present the plasticity as the conclusion of the manuscript. The author should further summarize the conclusion. 3. Why did the radial growth ranges be divided into three levels (3.76-4.14 mm/day; 3.36-3.74 mm/day, and 2.78-2.98 mm/day), what the criterion is based on.	1. In view of the results obtained, it does not untap a difference between the size of conidia and the places from which the <i>Fusarium</i> strains. Therefore, the origin of <i>Fusarium</i> strain does not affect the actual shape and size of conidia produced by each strain of <i>Fusarium</i>. 2. Ok, a new sentence was added in the conclusion. 3. The criterion used in this case was to categorize the <i>Fusarium</i> strains in relation to the speed of their radial growth.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		