



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48574
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Bacillus subtilis on Meloidogyne javanica and on tomato growth promotion
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <p>No clear connection between Phytohematoids and nematodes. Please make it clear for a person reading about the two for the first time</p> <p>M and Ms</p> <p>Is the Protocol for storage and dilution of B. subtilis documented? If so please put reference <i>Line 89 should read: Meloidogyne javanica</i> was multiplied in "Kada Gigante" tomato and left to grow for a period of 90 days.</p> <p>Write J2 in full at first mention</p> <p>Is the Onix commercial product a treatment on it's own. How come it is not applied both in the tube and pot. It should also be clearly stated that in the control you neither applied B. subtilis nor Onix if that is the case.</p> <p>Line 111: Experimental design seems to be misplaced. The experiment should be set up first before inoculations take place. Even if not practically, it should be implied in the write up.</p> <p>Alternatively remove the subtitle "exptal design" and make the reader know that after inoculations were done, the pots were assembled in a RCBD</p> <p>Results and discussions</p> <p>Analysis of variance table missing. It becomes hard to prove the 8 reps and the significance of results</p> <p>Let us know whether the reductions in number of eggs and J2s are significant or not. If significant, at what significant level??</p> <p>Reproduction factor is mentioned in the results but no information on how it is calculated in the M& Ms.</p> <p>Revise all Table headings so that they are short and precise</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Conclusion should be followed by a nice recommendation</p>	Corrections have been made in the manuscript
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	