



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_50072
Title of the Manuscript:	Control of phytopathogenic fungi using clove essential oil (Syzygium aromaticum L.)
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>-In the presented manuscript the authors reported the <i>in vitro</i> and <i>in vivo</i> antifungal activity of essential oil from <i>Syzygium aromaticum</i> L. against fungal pathogens of agricultural importance.</p> <p>-The manuscript is technically sound and I recommend minor revisions.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>-Fifth paragraph: please add "in" before humans (several health problems in humans)</p> <p>-Seventh paragraph: please change "your biological activities" to "its biological activity"</p> <p>Material and Methods</p> <p>2.2.1</p> <p>-First paragraph: Please correct the "desing" with seven treatment. Please remove autoclaved (this is inherent to the test) and add the medium used (PDA?).</p> <p>-Third paragraph: The following phrase can be removed "The different treatments were incorporated into the autoclaved flux-PDA (Potato Dextrose Agar) culture medium. After cooling, the medium was poured into Petri dishes with 7.5 cm in diameter under aseptic conditions. After solidification,". 1- Please add as the inoculum was obtained (from which time incubation of the culture?). Please remove: "type oven".</p> <p>-Please use MIC (minimum inhibitory concentration) instead MC, throughout the text. MIC was determined as the lowest concentration that provokes the total inhibition of micelial growth.</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>-Why did the authors not test higher concentrations of essential oil in the <i>in vivo</i> assays? Please, justify.</p> <p>-Second paragraph: please add % after 0.2. Please standardize B.O.D. (or BOD, see 2.2.1.) and remove the meaning of the acronym after the first description.</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>3.1.</p> <p>-Second paragraph: please change "The total inhibition of mycelial growth <i>Fusarium verticillioides</i> was obtained from the concentration of 0.05%" to "The total inhibition of mycelial growth of <i>Fusarium verticillioides</i> was obtained with the concentration of 0.05%".</p> <p>-When comparing the antifungal activity of essential oils that have already been studied, it is important to highlight their major chemical components. The similarities or differences between the results obtained in the present study may be due to differences in these components. Please see the third paragraph after Table 2 (page 6) and first paragraph after Figure 3 (page 8).</p> <p>3.2.</p> <p>-Page 7: please correct "inhibithory effect from the concentrarion".</p> <p>-Page 9: please add "in" before "reducing" (The clove essential oil was more efficient in reducing seed infection by <i>F. verticillioides</i>)</p> <p>-Page 9: the last two paragraphs of results and discussion refer to the conclusion of the study, which is repeated in the Conclusion.</p>	<p>Thank you so much for all the considerations and comments. All the suggestions were accepted and made. I am sure that your contributions have greatly raised the quality of the work.</p> <p>My sincere regards!</p> <p>Introduction: All modifications have been made.</p> <p>Material and Methods: All modifications have been made.</p> <p>1- Please add as the inoculum was obtained (from which time incubation of the culture?).</p> <p>2- We decided not to test higher concentrations of the oil in the <i>in vivo</i> experiment because we take its toxicity into account. If we tested concentrations above these, we could achieve a greater reduction in the percentage of infected seeds, but we would exceed the safe concentration limit of the use of clove oil, and it would no longer be a potential substitute for the synthetic fungicide.</p> <p>In other papers that we published, using other essential oils, we observed a significant reduction in the percentage of seeds infected with the increase of the oil concentration in the experiment <i>in vivo</i>, but always respecting the safe concentration of its use.</p> <p>Results and discussion</p> <p>- All suggested modifications were performed.</p> <p>- The last two paragraphs of the results and discussion were withdrawn and the conclusion was rewritten.</p> <p>- The bar color representing the fungicide Tiram was modified in the graphs and a caption was added.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>-Tables 1 and 2: please check the display of the numerical values.</p> <p>-Figures 2 and 3: I suggest changing the color or design of the bars representing Tiram and add a legend indicating the substances (Tiram and essential oil).</p>	
General comments	<p>Please:</p> <p>-use microorganism, instead of micro-organism.</p> <p>-The genus name can be abbreviated after the first description in full.</p>	-All modifications have been made.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	