



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_11026
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTAGONISTIC COMPATIBILITY OF <i>Streptomyces griseorubens</i> , <i>Gliocladium virens</i> , and <i>Trichoderma harzianum</i> AGAINST <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> CAUSE OF TOMATO WILT DISEASES.
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	<p>In this work the authors tried to evaluate the efficacy of different biocontrol agents against the wilt disease caused by <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> on tomato.</p> <p>From scientific point of view, the work is good and can be published. However, a lot of Grammatik and spelling mistakes exist in the article. I suggest that the paper to be reviewed by language specialist.</p> <p>The paper is not well organized. Some sections are merged with each other (e.g P2, L47). The paper needs a lot of formatting and editing</p> <p>The aim of the work is clear and in agreement with the conclusion.</p> <p>Introduction The introduction should be re written in chronological order focusing on the importance of biocontrol agents used in the study and the effect of the pathogen on tomato production in java-indonesia</p>	<p>Speeling mistake :Tree , screenhouse, glocose,extrac, mixture., ect, I agree and try to change the spelling</p> <p>1. Introduction <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> f.sp. <i>lycopersici</i> (FOL) is a highly destructive pathogen of both greenhouse and field grown tomatoes in warm vegetable production areas. The disease</p> <p>2. Method and Material 2.1 Isolation of Biological agents Isolation of biological agents used soil platting method by Dhingra and Sinclair (19): 1 gram</p> <p>3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 3.1 Compatibility test Growth average of diameter colony <i>S. griseorubens</i> (S) <i>G.virens</i> (G)and <i>T. harzianum</i> (T) in compatibility test (SGT) on</p> <p>Some changing and adding sentence in introduction Based on our survey,in East Java (Malang, Pare, Kediri) there was a 10 to 12 % yield loss.</p> <p>Some saprophyte soil microorganism have been used as comercial biological agentsIt, It can be single antagonistic or multi antagonistic (7)</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>M&M The author must indicate the inoculum volume used in each experiment (e.g. spore/ml) P2, L48. Also the concentration of FOL used to inoculated soil under greenhouse experiments must be indicted. M&M section is missing statistical analysis part. Also missed is the scaling system of disease severity (P3, L99-109). The author should indicate how and what type of statistics was used. The authors should consider the scientific method of writing M&M. In addition to that the author wrote in the conclusion that the identification of <i>Streptomyces griseorubens</i> was done using 16 sRNA, however, the author did not include this in the M&M.</p> <p>Results and Discussion Results are descriptive. Data must be described in more details. Statistical differences must be explained. All data presented in figures and tables must be explained in the text. Moreover the interpretation of the data in the discussion is not sufficient. The author should calculate the standard errors of the data in table 1, 2 and 3</p> <p>References References in the text should be written according to the</p>	<p>Compatibility test was done in Microbiology laboratorium of Agricultura Faculty by watching the type of biological agents growth in diskriptif and diameter colony. Data of diameter colony everage were analyze by t-test</p> <p>Antagonim compatibility <i>in vitro</i> was done by completely randomized design (CRD) with seven treatmen and every treatment was repeated three times. Data of percentage inhibition was analyzed by Duncan test</p> <p>Antibiosis test consist of 7 treatment placed in randomly, every treatment was done in three repeated.</p> <p>This research was done by completely randomized design (CRD) with seven treatmen and every treatment was repeated three times. Data of percentage inhibition was analyzed by Duncan test.</p> <p>The method of identification done by onather institution UNAIR and IPB and it is not the part of conclusion in this paper but knowedgement.I delete it</p> <p>I change the fig with table data, Standard error was added in Table 1,2,3</p>
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	journal format between []. The authors need to check again the references list (e.g Ref No 4 has no authorship and ref No 24 is duplicated with two different author names).	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>As said above, the paper must be reviewed by a language specialist Here are few comments</p> <p>The title must be lower case L68 here and everywhere 0.5 instead of 0,5 L71 <i>Trichoderma harzianum</i> here and every where in the manuscript use <i>T. harzianum</i> and the same for other microorganisms L 83 abbreviations below the equation L 90 here and everywhere in the text, never start a sentence with a number (write six instead of 6) L109 edit the formula in the box Figure 1 is not clear. Also the legend of the fig must below the figure axes titles are not understandable L 170 table title above the table</p>	I agree and corect the mistake
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		