



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_18262
Title of the Manuscript:	Eco-friendly oil-in-water emulsion formulation of eucalyptus oil against some important phytopathogenic fungi
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The study explored the effects of eucalyptus oil emulsion on selected phytopathogenic fungi The Abstract Line 8: use "investigated" instead of "prolonged" Line 12: ..delete "with" and insert "using" Lines 12 and 13: Comparison should be statistically substantiated. To say that the results showed a better storage without statistical substantiation is baseless. Line 15: It is not clear which active substance of eucalyptus the author is referring to. Introduction Line 20: potentiality has to change to potential Delete "yield" Line 21: delete "of their production of" and replace with "they produce" Line 28: insert such between "alternatives" and "as" Line 31: Put full-stop after "activity" and start the new sentence in this way: These natural protectants tend to have low.... Delete "as well as" Line 33: Delete "essential oils" Replace "gaining" with "gain" and "interest" with "attention" Line 35: Delete "functional" and replace "uses" with "use" Line 41: replace "a lake" with "the lack" Line 42: replace "its" with "their"	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 48 and 49: The sentence lacks logic Line 69: Put full-stop after study. Start a new sentence as follows: They are Colletotrichum Line 84: Replace “when” with “was” Lines 87 to 96: report on what you did. Your account should be in the past tense. Similarly take care of Lines 105 to 110 Lines 118 to 123 Lines: 135 to 140 Line 91: FAO should be written in full when appearing for the first time in the text. Delete: Line 112 and 113 up to “time” Line 145: Brookfield appears to be a reference to the preceding sentence, delete the full-stop before it. UL rotational adaptor? What does it mean? Line 152: replace “with” with “using” Line 158: replace “was” with “were” Results and Discussion It is difficult to determine the results found in this study. For example Paragraph 3.1 is more of literature review than an account on the results obtained in this study. This incorrect way of reporting on the results and discussion of the study regrettably predominates the rest of the document. A further example is Lines 180 to203. Lines 291 to 295: This is a repetition of what is indicated in the methods and it is not well phrased. As it is, the sentence lacks meaning.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	University of South Africa, South Africa