



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_48986
Title of the Manuscript:	Mycoparasitic capabilities of Trichoderma harzianum and two botanicals against fungi associated with postharvest rots of Ipomoea batatas (L.) Lam
Type of the 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>)

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	<p>The authors have done a fantastic job. Well done.</p> <p>Here's a quick question.</p> <p>After inoculating Sweet Potatoes in PDA, did you find <i>A.niger</i> and <i>R.stolonifer</i> to be predominating amongst other fungal contaminants?</p> <p>Did your findings explicitly show two contaminants ONLY (<i>A.niger</i> and <i>R.stolonifer</i>) If you have chosen to work on the predominant contaminants, it should be indicated in your report.</p>	Only these two fungi were isolated. This may be because surface sterilization was done exclude all microorganisms from the surface.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Good Job	

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>	