



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_26629
Title of the Manuscript:	Suppression of phytopathogenic fungi by plant extract of some weeds and the possible mode of action
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	Line 46 47-48 Move "In this work, we introduce many weeds for biological control of some phytopathogenic fungi as well as their mechanism of action" to the end of introduction part, and It must be emphasize as the main objective of this research work Line 66: include common name and botanical name of ten plant species Line 70: include a reference for this paragraph Line 72: specified a value for "room temperature" Line 79: cooling should be freezing Line 89-90: It is confuses the fungal inoculum concentration. Line 91: include information of "Standard antifungal Flucoral" Line 127: Include statistical analysis Item 3.1 and 3.2: Are there statistical significant differences among antimicrobial activity of the plant extracts samples against selected pathogens? Item 4. In this section include statistical differences (if they are) among different samples Tables 1. and 2. Designate letters to identify treatments with statistical differences within the table results. Line 365-368: This study was tested "<i>in vitro</i>". In this paper there are no information/results about "<i>in vivo</i>" studies. Are "<i>in vitro</i>" results correlated to "<i>in vivo</i>" results?. How?.	Ok, we did this change. We added the botanical name of the plant. Ok, we added a reference. Ok, the value of room temperature was specified Ok, the phrase was corrected It was clarified. It was done. Ok, the statistical analysis was included. It was demonstrated in tables 1 and 2. It was done. This study considered only the <i>in vitro</i> test and the mechanisms through which the plant extract affect the fungal pathogens.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 53: After Kingdom of Saudi Arabia INCLUDE (KSA) Line 73, 74 : 500-ml, should be 500-mL; and 100 ml should be 100 mL Use mL in the whole paper Line 97: the nutrient agar medium should be specified Line 108: % should be placed only after 95	Ok, it was done. Ok, it was done. It was corrected into Czapek's agar medium Ok, done.
Optional/General comments		