

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Re: Request for final decision for manuscript number 2012 AJEA 2811

Please find the attached file with my final decision for manuscript 2012 AJEA 2811.
My decision is: Accept As It Is.

Attached Part:

The final decision for manuscript number 2012 AJEA 2811 entitled “Interaction of fluorescent pseudomonads with *Pythiummultimum* and *Rhizoctoniasolani* in cucumber roots” byMazen Salman, RubaAbuamsha, and Sameer Barghouthi.

I carefully evaluated all versions of the manuscript. Initially the manuscript was criticized by two reviewers. Contrary to them the third reviewer recommended the manuscript for acceptance after minor revision. The revised version of the manuscript is significantly improved. Authors introduced to the manuscript many changes according almost too all reviewers’ suggestions and requirements. Re-review of the manuscript showed that one of the criticizing reviewer change his mind and accepted corrections.

In my opinion the manuscript is well written and data presented are useful for science. So my final decision is: AcceptAs It Is.

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Sun, Feb 17, 2013 at 4:26 PM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Re: Request for final decision for manuscript number 2012 AJEA 2811

Please find the attached file with my final decision for manuscript 2012 AJEA 2811. I slightly modified description of my decision but my final decision still is: Accept As It Is.

Attached Part:

The final decision for manuscript number 2012 AJEA 2811 entitled “Interaction of fluorescent pseudomonads with *Pythium ultimum* and *Rhizoctonia solani* in cucumber roots” by Mazen Salman, Ruba Abuamsha, and Sameer Barghouthi.

I carefully evaluated all versions of the manuscript. Initially the manuscript was criticized by two reviewers. Contrary to them the third reviewer recommended the manuscript for acceptance after minor revision. The revised version of the manuscript is significantly improved. Authors introduced to the manuscript many changes according almost too all reviewers’ suggestions and requirements. Re-review of the manuscript showed that one of the criticizing reviewer change his mind and accepted corrections. Second criticizing reviewer, although accepted some corrections, still recommended rejection of the manuscript because of the lack of its novelty.

In my opinion the manuscript is well written and data presented are useful for science as the well done confirmation of the described topic. So my final decision is: Accept As It Is.

Editor’s Details:

Dr. Sławomir Borek

Department of Plant Physiology, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide the email id.