



## SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

### PART 1:

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_31549
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and characterization of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria <i>Enterobacter hormaechei</i> and their suppression efficacy against <i>Colletotrichum falcatum</i> combination with chitosan
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

### PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>This study isolated and characterized rhizobacteria, <i>Enterobacter hormaechei</i> from sugarcane and revealed synergistic growth-inhibitory effects with chitosan on the red rot causing fungus, <i>C. falcatum</i>. However, as commented previously, in vitro production of indole-3-acetic acid, hydrogen cyanide, ammonia production makes isolate potentially being the plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR); but is not necessary sufficient evidence for the claim of being one. Secondly, to make this manuscript easily understood, editing by native English speaker would be necessary.</p> <p>A few examples:</p> <p>The title of the manuscript, "Isolation and characterization of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria <i>Enterobacter hormaechei</i> and their suppression efficacy against <i>Colletotrichum falcatum</i> combination with chitosan", could be rewrite as ".....in combination with chitosan".</p> <p>Abstract section: line 21 "In vitro assays, chitosan and chitooligosaccharides (COS) caused differential growth inhibition." was not clear.</p> <p>Line 29 "This research work explores new antifungal combination to overcome on red rot disease of sugarcane using PGPR and chitosan." contains grammar mistakes.</p> <p>Line 40 "Although it is well known that ISR triggered by PGPR confers resistance against pathogen-induced plant diseases." is not a complete sentence.</p> <p>Line 237 to 239 "The diameter of radial growth of <i>C. falcatum</i> is larger in 0.6 % than that of other concentration of chitosan 0.2%, 0.4%, and indicating <i>C. falcatum</i> is susceptible to chitosan at the dose of 0.6%." was contradicted with the results described in Fig 8.</p>	<p>As per your comments, the strain is showing very strong qualitative plant growth promoting activities like indole-3-acetic acid, hydrogen cyanide, ammonia production that can be observe in Fig 2. It is a part of our study and we are focussing on the bio-control study that's why we didn't mention quantative analysis of PGP activities like IAA etc. Further works of our studies are also under process. That cannot be possible to add in this manuscript. I have made all said corrections given below in left column. We have checked our manuscript by our colleague having good English skill. Sorry to say but here, we don't have any native English speaker.</p>