



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_51128
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of alcoholic extracts of <i>Cymbopogon citratus</i> upon the control of <i>Colletotrichum gloeosporioides</i> in vitro and upon the post-harvest quality of guavas
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>There is one possible major flaw with the method. The authors state “The ethanolic and methanolic extracts of lemongrass were separately incorporated into the PDA medium at the following concentrations: 8%, 5%, 3%, 1.5% and 0.5% (p/v). They were later sterilized by autoclaving and placed in Petri dishes.” Did the authors check if the natural products with fungicidal properties are volatile or affected by high heat? My main concern is that the authors treat the fruit by “were immersed for 1 minute, in the following treatments: distilled water (Control); ethanolic extract (ECL) and methanolic extract (MCL) at 1%; 0.5% and 0.25%.” This is a completely different use of the extract. No heat is involved here and the composition might be different. Can the authors produce some data on the composition of the extract? Especially before and after autoclaving! Maybe one of the heat decomposed products is the main anti-fungal agent and that is why it was not effective <i>in vivo</i>.</p> <p>Also, this leads to a great limitation of the study. <i>In vitro</i> the extract is tested up to 8% but then <i>in vivo</i> the maximum is just 1%. What is the reasoning behind this choice? Can the authors try immersion in 5% and 10% of the extract?</p> <p>The manuscript would benefit from the following corrections:</p> <p>In the Abstract, the sentence “Upon the search for alternatives for the control of post-harvest diseases, it is necessary to search for new methods that are associated to the conservation of fruit quality.” should be reworded as it is not in correct English and the meaning is difficult to interpret.</p> <p>The phrases “At the post-harvest essay” and “At the test <i>in vitro</i>” should read “In the post-harvest assay” and “In the test <i>in vitro</i>”</p> <p>The Spanish abstract was not checked as Spanish is not within my competence. This should be reviewed by a Spanish-speaking reviewer</p> <p>The sentence “Guava (<i>Psidium guajava</i>) is mostly appreciated both fresh and industrially processed” should read “Guava (<i>Psidium guajava</i>) is appreciated both fresh and industrially processed”</p> <p>The references in-text should be numbered consecutively in square brackets</p> <p>The reference list should be reformatted to match the expected standard journal format</p> <p>The phrase “both for its direct fungitoxic action” should read “both for their direct fungitoxic action”</p> <p>The phrase “We triturated 200 g of fresh leaves”, “We used fully randomized design”, “we used five repetitions” and “we used 7 treatments” should be reworded to eliminate pronouns e.g. “200 g of fresh leaves were triturated” and “A fully randomized design was used”, “five repetitions were used”, “7 treatments were used”</p> <p>All mentions of “ethylic alcohol” and “methyl alcohol” in the text should be replaced by “ethanol” and “methanol” respectively</p>	



	<p>If “<i>et al.</i>” will be used in the text it should always be in italics</p> <p>The sentence “With the data was calculate the area under the mycelial growth curve (AUMGC), the equation proposed by Campbell and Madden (1990).” needs rewording as it is not in correct English.</p> <p>The phrase “in the optical microscope” should read “under the optical microscope”</p> <p>The phrase “reducing (RS) and non-reducing sugars (NS) in glucose” makes no sense because glucose already a kind of sugar. Please reword</p> <p>The phrase “In presence” should read “In the presence”</p> <p>The phrase “mycelial growth in 77%” should read “mycelial growth by 77%”</p> <p>The paragraph “At higher concentrations, the treatment with ethanolic extract affected significantly the growth <i>in vitro</i> of the pathogen. There was a dose-dependent effect, i.e., the higher the concentration of the extract, the higher was the inhibition of mycelial growth of the plant pathogen. The total inhibition of the mycelial growth occurred at the concentration of 8% of ethanolic extract. In presence of methanolic extract, the highest concentrations showed the highest values of growth inhibition. At 8%, the extract inhibited the mycelial growth in 79.3%.” is identical in meaning to the previous one but the % value is different! Either delete or reword</p> <p>The phrase “upon the different extracts” should read “upon the use of different extracts”</p> <p>The phrase “the concentration 8%“ should read “the concentration of 8%“</p> <p>The phrase “The same authors yet explains that is means” should read “The same authors explain that this means“</p> <p>The phrase “ethanolic extract (ECL) and methanolic lemon grass (MCL) and 8 days” should read “ethanolic lemon grass extract (ECL) and methanolic lemon grass extract (MCL) after 8 days”</p> <p>The phrase “appressoria that penetrates” should read “appressoria that penetrate”</p> <p>The phrase “The resistance of the unripe fruit to the fungus attack “ should read “The resistance of the unripe fruit to the fungal attack“</p> <p>The phrase “indicating positive effect” should read “indicating a positive effect”</p> <p>The authors state “the extracts with ethylic acid showed an increase in soluble solids and the extracts with methyl acid, showed a decrease;” Is this use of acid a spelling mistake or was acid used instead of alcohol?</p> <p>The authors state “once soluble solids increase as the fruit ripens, due to the decrease in acidity” but these two properties are not directly linked. A decrease in pH does not increase soluble solids. Please reword</p> <p>The phrase “methyl extract at 1%” should read “methanolic extract at 1%”</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Byron Baron</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Malta, Malta</b>