

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_50072
Title of the Manuscript:	Control of phytopatogenic 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 <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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
		highlight that part in the manus his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	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. The manuscript is technically sound and I recommend minor revisions.	
	Introduction Fifth paragraph: please add "in" before humans (several health problems in humans) Seventh paragraph: please change "your biological activities" to " its biological activity"	
	Material and Methods 2.2.1 First paragraph: Please correct the "desing" with seven treatment. Please remove autoclaved (this is inherent to the test) and add the medium used (PDA?). 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,". Please add as the inoculum was obtained (from which time incubation of the culture?). Please remove: "type oven". 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.	
	 2.2.2 Why did the authors not test higher concentrations of essential oil in the <i>in vivo</i> assays? Please, justify. 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. 	
	Results and Discussion 3.1. Second paragraph: please change "The total inhibition of mycelial growth <i>Fusarium</i> <i>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%". 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). 3.2. Page 7: please correct "inhibithory effect from the concentrarion". Page 9: please add "in" before "reducing" (The clove essential oil was more efficient in reducing seed infection by <i>F. verticillioides</i> " Page 9: the last two paragraphs of results and discussion refer to the conclusion of the	
	study, which is repeated in the Conclusion. Tables 1 and 2: please check the display of the numerical values.	
	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).	

ed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

General comments	Please: -use microorganism, instead of micro-organism. -The genus name can be abbreviated after the first description in full.	

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed w that part in the manuscript. It is r feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sueli Fumie Yamada-Ogatta
Department, University & Country	Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Brazil

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight s mandatory that authors should write his/her