



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_31864
Title of the Manuscript:	Leaf Tip Die- Back of Yucca elephantipes caused by Lasidiplodia theobromae Pat. and Production of Phytotoxin in Culture Filtrate and Infected Leaves
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	It is a very interesting article, but I have a lot of comments about it. The name of the fungus seems to be <i>Diplodia theobromae</i> (Farr, D.F., & Rossman, A.Y. Fungal Databases, U.S. National Fungus Collections, ARS, USDA. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from https://nt.ars-grin.gov/fungaldatabases/). It seems not to be cited before on Yucca, so pathogenicity tests are necessary. It is not possible to say "It is the first report of the occurrence of the pathogen on yucca" Line 147-148 without pathogenicity tests. Lines 143 to 158 must be incorporated to the Introduction. Line 39 replace "elephantepes" by "elephantipes" Line 40 replace "infected by a disease" by "affected by a disease". Line 79 replace "7" by "8". Paper 7 Ikotum T, 1975 is not cited. There are mistakes in the numbers of bibliographic citations from 8 on. How was the fungus identified? Characteristics and bibliography. Molecular identification?	Diplodia is the anamorphic stage of this group. it could septate or aseptate. The specimen we identified was septate The authors checked through the host record in the database provided but we did not find a connection between yucca and the pathogen Line 143- 158 are part of my result not sourced information All other corrections has been made.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		