



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48573
Title of the Manuscript:	Liquid Bacillus subtilis Formulation in Rice in the Control of Meloidogyne javanica and Lettuce Development
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>)

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>Extremely necessary a review of the whole text and the English language.</p> <p>Abstract: Clarify the methodology, 8 to 15 days after what? Planting? Transplanting? Put what is the Onix product, not just the comercial name.</p> <p>Introduction: whenever you quote a new species for the first time in the text put the scientific name of it.</p> <p>Material and methods: 2.2 Substrate composed of soil and what else? At the 3: 1 ratio, what is what?</p> <p>Clarifying the days of irrigation, was performed 8 and 15 days after what?</p> <p>Line 117 - "and 2 controls" what controls are these? Other than Onix and water?</p> <p>Only the Onix treatment was applied one day after the transplant? Was it applied only once?</p> <p>Where did the nematode inoculum come from? Which plant?</p> <p>Improve the material and methods, better explain what was done. Standardize as you write the name of the rhizobacteria.</p> <p>The Results and Discussion it is okay.</p>	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juliana de Oliveira Silva
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Brasil