



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_3690
Title of the Manuscript:	SCREENING FOR NEMATOCIDAL ACTIVITIES OF BACILLUS SPECIES AGAINST ROOT KNOT NEMATODE (Meloidogyne incognita)

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper describes the nematocidal activity of <i>Bacillus</i> species isolated from rhizosphere soil. Overall, the finding is interesting, however the author must improve the manuscript. The present form is confusing and not acceptable. Detailed suggestions are given below. 1. Abstract. This part should be rewritten. Many grammatical errors. The scientific name should be used correctly both in Title and in the text. The scientific name of pepper should also given when first mentioned. 2. Also, check the use of English in Introduction. 3. Materials and Methods: * check the concentration unit in line 89. * use '16S rRNA gene'. * explain the procedure used for genomic DNA extraction. * provide detailed information of the PCR procedure. * also, briefly provide the methodology of the enzyme activity assay. * specify the compositions (amounts) of YPD medium. * provide the information where you sequenced	• All the comments have been amend according. • All the correction was highlighted in yellow colour 1. Abstract was rewritten 2. English in Introduction was checked and amended 3. All the comments in Materials and Methods and Results and Discussion have been amended accordingly. 4. Agreed with the comment that protease might be/might not be the mechanism of action for <i>Bacillus</i> against nematodes. Therefore, this conclusion has been amended to "nematicidal activity displayed by <i>Bacillus</i> strains is related with its proteolytic activity. 5. Results for 16S RNA were added. 4. Majority of this paper has been rewritten 5. The Numbers of references has been reduced



SDI Review Form 1.6

	your DNA sequences. 4. Results and Discussion: * rewrite the section 3.1. Provide the data of how you preliminary screen nematicidal activity of <i>Bacillus</i> strains. * to summarise that the activity was from protease activity; this is not certain. There may be other possible reasons. How about the secondary metabolites??? The author cannot make such a conclusion. * This part must be heavily revised. There was no data of Blast search. What was the point to carry out the sequencing of the 16S rRNA gene then? The detection of protease gene is also not relevant to the nematicidal activity as concluded by the author. This is just to confirm the test of protease activity assay. 5. Overall comments: * The paper must be revised and rewritten. * The key finding is probably to determine the nematicidal activity of these <i>Bacillus</i> strains. Emphasise this result with a careful presentation. * Proofread the manuscript by your colleagues and native English speaker. * Too many references. The numbers of references cited should be between 15 – 20. * Check the format of references and there are also many errors in the references cited (i.e., no. 21).	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		