



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_28863
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the synergism of entomopathogenic organisms associated with <i>Zonocerus variegatus</i>
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

	Include statistical results and explain based on them. Table 2 formats should be modified according to table 1. DISCUSSION: Complete the action mechanisms of <i>Bacillus</i> sp. Include LD50 organisms' discussion. Explain why the isolated organisms had better results than the mixed treatments. CONCLUSION: It needs to be included. REFERENCES: Review. They should be numbered.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some different formats in paragraphs lines inside the text. It should be reviewed. Review all text formats. Review the scientific names and abbreviate them after first text appearance.	These have been taken care of
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is simple but it has scientific worth. It cannot be published in the British Microbiology Research Journal because it statistical analysis and results are missing. Statistic and some methodology information like number and repetition in each experiment have to be included to allow the correct article judgment. It was not found in the introduction or in the justification the objective of the study. Tables have different format. Lethal Doses 50 were not discussed and there is no conclusion in the text. The References need to be improved. They are not in numeric order. There are also other suggestions informed in notes inside the pdf format article. I believe that with the suggestions, reviews, statistical and information additions, the decision about this article could be reconsidered.	All of these have been included. All experiments were carried out in triplicates. This is further shown by the error bars. Charts that appear to have their error bars 'missing' are those charts having the same values for the three times the tests are carried out. Since the values are the same, there was no error room for the displacement of the bars.