SCIENCEDOMAIN international
www.sciencedomain.org

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)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	1. The topic should read inhibitory potential of *Trichoderma harzianum* and two botanicals against fungi associated with postharvest rot of *Ipomoea batatas* L. 2. The introduction is too long. Please, make it one page only. 3. PDA should be written in full before abbreviation. 4. Please, explain in detail how subculturing was done. 5. Give step by step procedure on how characterization and identification of isolated fungi was done. What you have put down is a summary. 6. You need to explain in detail (step by step) procedure how the Trichoderma was isolated and characterized. How it was confirmed that the organism was *Trichoderma*. 7. You need to explain in detail (step by step) procedure how the extract concentrations of 25, 50, 75 and 100% were obtained. 8. You need to explain in detail (step by step) procedure in the manuscript how you arrived at the spore suspensions of the *Trichoderma*. 9. You need to explain clearly and in details how the Trichoderma was used to inhibit the growth of the fungus. What you have written down is not clear enough and it is confusing. 10. There is no experimental design for the experiment. Bring out the factors of the experiment, treatment combinations and levels, number of plots. 11. Please, insert each Table at the appropriate section in the results section. 12. Plate 3 has no photomicrograph. You need to place the picture of Trichoderma harzianum in that section so one can know how it looks like. You just placed the growth in the plate. 13. The results presented in the tables are wrongly presented. The experiment is a factorial experiment. You need to bring out the main and interaction effects of the antagonists and their concentrations against the isolated fungi. 14. Arrange the manuscript according to the journal specifications. 15. Make compulsory grammatical corrections in the entire manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Authors need to bring out a concise experimental design to enhance understanding of the experimental layout. They also need to explain how the pairing of the Trichoderma with the isolated fungi to enhance inhibition took place.	

	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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Liamngee Kator*
Department, University & Country	*Benue State University, Nigeria.*