



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_6619
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro antagonistic potentials against fungal plant pathogens of soil actinomycetes species from the National Park "El Chico", a protected forest in México
Type of the Article	Short Communication

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 motivation of the research work not fits well the problem that you want to solve. What is the problem ? What are the crops that it want protect ? The sample preparation followed a well-defined protocol?Bibliography it is necessary. If the protocol has been changed it is necessary to explain why. Where the analyzes were carried out? Were the organisms tested (Helminthosporium sp., Curvularia sp., and Aspergillus niger) target or non-target? Missing bibliography Results are not discussed comparing with references. The inhibition may be due for physical and chemical interactions: it is necessary to show images and / or analytical data related. It is necessary to improve the Fig. 2. It Is necessary to improve English. Article requires a Serious Major revision	
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer