



## 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Zhongmin Dong</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Department of Biology, Saint Mary's University, Canada</b>