



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 AJEA 2811
Title of the Manuscript:	Interaction of fluorescent pseudomonads with <i>Pythium ultimum</i> and <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> in cucumber roots

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	Authors describe in the manuscript an effect of fluorescent <i>Pseudomonas</i> isolate CW2 on growth and morphology of <i>Pythium ultimum</i> and <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> hyphae. Antagonistic effect of CW2 on cucumber roots colonization by above mentioned fungi is described in the manuscript. The test is well written. There are no any doubts that experiments were carried properly and carefully. Results are well described. However, correction of figure 3, 4, and 5 is needed (see below). Data are properly statistically analysed and are discussed enough.	We would like to thank the reviewer for his positive comments. All suggestions were taken in consideration
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. References must be marked in the text with numbers, like [1], [2], [3-5] etc. References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text; not alphabetically. Moreover, Reference list is prepared not exactly to AJEA requirements. Spacing and punctuation must be corrected. See to 'Author's instruction' or to 'MS word paper template' which are available at http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=general-guideline-for-authors 2. I propose to move the 2.6 subsection after 2.3 subsection. In this way ordering of 'Materials and methods' will be more coherent with data presentation in 'Results'. 3. Line 83. It is written that CW2 was added to fungal cultures after 3days, while in 'Results' (line 175) there is 4	Done Done and the sections were re numbered Corrected 3 days



SDI Review Form 1.6

	days. 4. Subsections of 'Results' are wrong numbered. '3.1 Results' should be deleted '3.1.1' should be changed to '3.1' '3.1.2' to '3.2' '3.1.3' to '3.3' '3.1.4' to '3.3.1' '3.1.4' to '3.3.2' '3.1.5' to '3.4' 5. IMPORTANT. All electronograms should be presented in considerably higher resolution. Additionally, electronograms presented on figure 3, 4 and 5 must be maximally enlarged; up to page width. Moreover, denotations of figures' parts (a, b, c, ... i) must be also enlarged. Bars and magnifications are not readable, so they must be enlarged as well. 6. IMPOTRANT. Bacteria cells should be precisely indicated by arrows on electronograms. 7. Caption of figure 5 should be a little changed. I propose 'Scanning electron micrographs showing an effect of the interaction...' 9. Ongena et al. 1999, and Van Loon et al. 1998 are listed in 'References' but are not cited in the text. 10. Minor points. The last line of Abstract, remove 'patients' Line 21, remove '(ARIAL, BOLD ... CAPS)' Line 141, remove space from 'colonies' Line 183, remove '-' from 'significantly'	Changed Done Done Changed Were removed from the list of references 'patients' was removed '(ARIAL, BOLD ... CAPS)' removed Spaces was removed - was removed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		