



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_29850
Title of the Manuscript:	Black rot ( <i>Xanthomonas campestris</i> pv. <i>campestris</i> ) control in field grown Cabbage ( <i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. Sugar loaf) with <i>Moringa oleifera</i> extracts
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>I want to congratulate the author/s for putting together this good scientific piece. The authors followed the scientific approach and showed evidence of reviewing the literature.</b>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	The explaining of the results is somewhat vague. For instance you indicated in line 154 that they showed great significance but you didn't indicate at what level. You should have also indicated which of the treatments exhibited the greatest and least activity.  Also $P < 0.05$ is used to determine significant difference whereas $P > 0.05$ no significant difference.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Andell Edwards</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Animal Science, University of Trinidad and Tobago, Trinidad and Tobago</b>