

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_107005
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation, Characterization and Identification of Cassava Bacterial Soft Rot Isolates, Homa-Bay County, Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript submitted to this journal entitled " Isolation, Characterization and Identification of Cassava Bacterial Soft Rot Isolates, Homa-Bay County, Kenya " is an interesting topic for publication. But the authors need to make some minor revisions, which is given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The topic of the manuscript is interesting and important for the scientific community. Dealing with this topic is very interesting and exciting and has a high scientific level and also is acceptable to the scientific community. 2) The title needs to be modified and should be written as follows: Isolation and identification of bacterial soft-rot-causing isolates from cassava, Homa-Bay County, Kenya 3) The abstract section is not coherent and should be corrected. 4) The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5) The manuscript is scientifically acceptable. 6) It is better to use newer references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>- No. The manuscript should be corrected in terms of native English.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In this study, it is better to explain the study area more.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maziar Naderi
Department, University & Country	Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran