



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_9021
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation the Efficacy of Baker Yeast (<i>Saccaromyces cerevisiae</i>) and Chitosan to Controlling <i>Penicillium digitatum</i> Sacc. That Cause Green Mold Decay of Kumquat Fruits.
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	Which reference has been used to determine percentage of infected fruits and disease severity? Did the differences among treatment being analysed using any statistical methods? Any data transformation involved analysing data in percentage and severity? Table and Figure showed same result. Author should choose only one method to present his result. Authors only look into the efficacy of baker yeast and chitosan after certain period of storage. How about the quality of fruit after storage period which may affect consumer acceptability of the fruit.	Chalutz et. Al.,1989 Action has been deleted for the forms of figure at the request of one of the reviewer. At the end of storage period the decayed fruits were counted and then the percentage of disease incidence calculated in relative to control treatment, evaluation of the applied formula on the fruit rot development expressed as percentage of fruit rotted tissue was recorded.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript contains substantial typo error and grammatical error. Chitosan ¼% vs ¼% chitosan? Backer vs baker? The format of citation used was rather confusing.	Action was required amendment
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		