



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12211
Title of the Manuscript:	Catambra activity against Meloidogyne spp
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

PART 1: 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	Peer Revision: The article is attractive for agriculture and science. But, some suggestions are made to improve its reading and interest of the scientist. Moreover, it is important to improve the English edition (see for example: L115-118, L 150-155; L167-171, etc.). See a few words with wrong spelling as cataplol and L 58 - Family Bignoniaceae, etc. The addition of words like 'Catambra extracts ' or 'Catambra metabolites' to the title will help the understanding of the article content. Introduction The introduction is very extensive on nematodes and their control. Focus on the use of extracts or metabolites of plants will become it more attractive and help in the discussion. Ex: removal of L18 to L38 and L46 to L52 do not affect the text. Figures 1 and 2 may probably be deleted without impacting the article understanding. Material and Methods Item 2.1. on methodology is the right place to talk	Changes have been made accordingly, considering reviewer's 2 comments All changes are highlighted (yellow) on the revised manuscript text Title has changed Changes have been made accordingly Figure 1 was deleted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	about the characteristics of the extracts C1 - C4 and add more information about them, the differences among the extracts, etc. Bring L146-147 to here. Maybe authors should not use the EC₅₀ because they were not able to determine the maximum effect of the product, so its use seems inappropriate. Remember the EC₅₀ of a graded dose response curve therefore represents the concentration of a compound where 50% <u>of its maximal</u> effect is observed. Item 2.3. in L108, it was reported that juveniles were obtained by Hussey and Barker's technique, but probably only the eggs were extracted by this technique. I believe that these eggs were used for obtaining the J2, and authors need to tell how it was done. Lines L121 to L122 and L140: please inform the used concentrations. In L131, the authors told that the evaluation was made at 12, 24 ... 96 h, but not all the results were presented. If they are not important, they should be removed of the methodology.	Changes have been made accordingly L146-147 was moved here. In cases where EC₅₀ values are reported, a clear dose response relationship was established and the values were calculated following probit analysis Changes have been made accordingly. A more detailed description of the method is included (Ntalli et al, 2009) used concentrations were added A dose response relationship was obvious from the first measurements (12 h) for the most effective extracts and the highest activity was found after 48 h of J2 immersion. The activity found after 96 h was similar. For this, EC₅₀ values calculated for this time (48 h) were selected to present.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Results and Discussion Lines L146-147 should go to M&M, because there is no place for them in Results. The writing is confusing in L151 also L150, and this isn't the best place for them, perhaps in M&M... In L166, it is suggested the inclusion of data of catalpol commercial/standard. Which the average values of the test of motility? If it was different from 0, then get at least the amplitudes. Tab. 1. The authors are urged to do a rewording in the title of the table (it must be self explicative): ... <i>Meloidogyne javanica</i> and <i>M. incognita</i>... test solutions of ... what (complete)? Please, check the times of immersion in the M&M and observe the column of periods: would be 12 h instead of 1h? Where are the 96 h data? I think if the authors want, the formatting of the table could be less packed. Figure 3: the appearance of this figure also should be cleaner, some words could be removed, as example, the elimination of 'Extract C-4', 'a species of nematodes' (these may come in the legend). The abscissa of the Figures should contain all the studied concentrations, not only those 100 and 1000 µg/ml. It seems very strange the abscissa start in 10 when the Y axis begins in zero. I think the authors would be referring to a regression curve rather than interconnected points	L146-147 was moved to M&M. Changes have been made accordingly Data were added Changes and corrections have been made accordingly in Table 1 the 96 h data are not presented (see above for details) Changes and corrections have been made accordingly in Figure 2 (<i>Figure 3 changed in Figure 2</i>) X axis is in logarithmic scale (it is reported in the text)
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	as showed in the figures, thus the figures should be changed. The discussion needs to be improved.	Changes are included
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		