

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_117491
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of <i>Phyllosticta citricarpa</i> causing citrus black spot disease in Benin
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. Although the methods used in the study were not new, the isolation and identification of the agent that caused the black spot disease in citrus fruits in Benin are of the fundamental help to the research community for finding the way of prevention, treatment and management of the disease caused by this fungus in Benin. 2. The title of the article should be changed to: "Isolation, Identification and Characterization of <i>Phyllosticta citricarpa</i> causing citrus black spot disease in Benin". However, more information and images on identification and characterization should be provided for full and accurate support of this title. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. Yes, they are. 5. Yes, it is. However, it is not informative enough. 6. Yes, the references are sufficient and quite recent. <p>More comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the glycerol : glucose solution for preserving the isolates: the authors should make the glucose concentration clear. - Page 11: Did authors mean a Malassez cell counting chamber for "Malassez cell"? Please make this clear. - In the binocular examination, what is the binocular resolution? - Authors need to clarify the 66 isolates, either by their morphological characteristics or by their nucleotide sequences, or by both. They were already labelled with different codes, however, were they really different strains? As the ITS regions were all cloned and were forward and reverse sequenced (page 9), they could be used to infer the similarity or difference among the isolates. - Figure 1: Morphological identification of <i>Phyllosticta</i> sp.: Authors need to label the three separate pictures and describe each of the picture clearly so that readers can understand what are actually in the pictures. Provide more images if there were differences in morphology among the isolates. - The information in Tables 1 and 3 overlaps, so authors should combine these two tables into one or make Table 3 more concise. - Figure 2: Explain reasonably about the appearance of the bands below 550 bp. - The Genbank sequences and their number shown in Table 2 should be the same as those shown in Figure 4. This figure should include only those isolates (obtained in this study) that were genetically different. - Microscopic pictures of the pathogenicity test should be provided to clarify the Koch's postulates for <i>P. citricarpa</i>. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. There are, however, some minor things that authors need to consider editing, such as: abundance (page 2), et al with a dot (et al.).	
Optional/General comments	This study obtained 66 fungal isolates that cause black spot disease on the citrus from the diseased fruits collected in four different regions of Benin, identified and characterized them. Isolation results were verified on the basis of the fungal colony and cell morphological characteristics as well as the rDNA nucleotide sequences. The results show that the isolates were all <i>Phyllosticta citricarpa</i> , and that they all have the ITS rDNA sequence identical to strains of <i>P. citricarpa</i> from Australia, Zimbabwe and Brazil. Though so, the authors did not mention to what extent these 66 isolates were similar or different? Were they the same or different <i>Phyllosticta citricarpa</i> strains, because if they were all the same or divided into different groups, then the way of presenting and arranging information and images in the manuscript would be much more compact and concise. To make the manuscript more informative and valuable, the authors should consider editing the content of the manuscript according to the comments above.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Phan Thi Huyen
Department, University & Country	Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology, Vietnam