



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_49260
Title of the Manuscript:	Biocontrol of <i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i> using antagonistic activities of pseudomonads
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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>It is mandatory to include a chapter of Conclusions.</p> <p>Include the units of measurement in the equation used to calculate the percentage of mycelial inhibition <i>in vitro</i> and describe how this measurement was carried out.</p> <p>Include the methodological description of the sclerotia quantification technique used to generate the results of Table 2.</p> <p>It is necessary to include the formula used to calculate the percentage of sclerotia reduction used with the PUR46 strain.</p> <p>It is not mentioned in the text for what purpose the values transformed with arcsen presented in Table 2 were used.</p> <p>In Table 1 it is important to specify numerically the degree of inhibition of the pathogen (Pi), since a quantitative technique was used for this purpose.</p>	Suggestions has been incorporated in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Although promising results were obtained, 77% (23/30) of the evaluated <i>Pseudomonas</i> strains had no effect on the growth of the pathogen <i>in vitro</i>. This may be associated with the origin of the isolates, therefore, it would be valuable to add a Table with descriptive information of these isolates (e. g. date of collection, collection site, type of sample from which it was isolated, geographical location, etc.).</p>	As per your suggestion, Table 1 was incorporated in the ms.

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>	No