



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 NEMATICIDAL 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors obtained interesting scientific results that are not enough discussed. Authors emphasized results from previous investigations, masking their valuable scientific results displayed through the experimental evidences presented here.	1. Agreed with the comment. Additional information was added.
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction Line 67, change small molecules by antimicrobial peptides of low molecular weight. The main objective of the investigation is not clearly exposed Results and discussion The section should be titled as RESULTS, because there is another section including discussion of the results (see DISCUSSION). There are some orthographic errors as: RESULTS AN (and) DISCUSSION. The English language style should be revised. 3.1. Isolation and identification Some introductory aspects correspond to material and methods section. Explanations should emphasize the results obtained. 3.2 Bacterial Isolates Characterization The scientific writing style should be improved. Line 185. I suggest: <i>The results obtained show that two strains (MPB04, MPB115) produced cellulases. The strains...produced proteases....(Table 3)</i> 3.4. PCR Analysis and BLAST search I think that the epigraph title should be improved; I suggest something as <i>Nucleotide sequences analysis and</i>	1. All the comments have been amended according. 2. All the corrections were highlighted in yellow colour. Results and discussion This section title was changed to RESULTS only 3.1 Additonal information was added 3.2 The writing style was amended according to reviewer request. 3.4This epigraph title was amended to <i>Nucleotide sequences analysis and proteases gene identification</i> 3.5 The writing style was amended according to reviewer request. Discussion The correction was done and highlighted in yellow colour.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>proteases gene identification.</i> 3.5. Biocontrol of <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> on Peper Vine The scientific writing style should be improved (see previous observations in epigraph 3.2) Discussion Line 272. Does <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> secrete proteins or proteases enzymes in abundance? Line 279. <i>Bacillus sp strains MPB04</i> and... instead of <i>Bacillus species strain...</i> Line 282. I suggest, <i>the cuticle of nematodes is rigid and contains proteins and chitins..., so our results suggest that the nematocidal activity displayed by Bacillus strains is related with its proteolytic activity responsible of nematode penetration by bacterial strains...</i>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	English language should be review. The writing (scientific) style should be corrected.	