

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_104632
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of major fungal pathogens on growth and yield of improved and local sorghum genotypes under field trials in lower Eastern Kenya.
Type of the Article	Original research

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>Yes. The author(s) sort to study and report on the most critical fungi diseases which have not been studied in the area. Their impact on growth and yield was as well discussed.</p> <p>No. I suggest 'Effects of major fungal diseases on growth and yield of sorghum in lower Eastern Kenya</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but there are a lot of mishaps in the result presentation. For each of the diseases, results must be presented for each variety/genotype and location. It must not be Merged.</p> <p>The references are sufficient.</p> <p>I think they must take their time to address a few scientific issues. Eg, some laboratory studies to confirm their new diseases. I have left numerous significant suggestions in tract changes on the document.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I will score it an average. Or 60%</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is a good work in all.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Isaac Boatey Akpatsu
Department, University & Country	Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT, Ghana