

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ JABB_115627
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro evaluation of rhizobacterial isolates against Fusarium oxysporum f.sp. ricini and Rotylenchulus reniformis infesting Castor
Type of the Article	

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	2- In vitro evaluation of rhizobacterial isolates against (List the name of the plant from which the rhizosphere was isolated Types of rhizobacteria)Fusarium oxysporum f.sp. ricini and Rotylenchulus reniformis infesting Castor Why did the various types of literature not indicate in the summary the four most effective rhizobacteria and identified them as Bacillus sp. 3- In the abstract, the author replaces the scientific name of the plant from which rhizobacteria are isolated alternatives to oilseed . 4- yeas 5- yeas 6- yeas Note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The author must mention the scientific name of the plant from which rhizobacterial samples were isolated from the rhizosphere, mentioning the plant's growing region, and not just mention oilseed because it is ambiguous. - Why did the author not mention any details about the diagnosis of other types of Rhizobacteria and confined himself to only four types? It was not even mentioned whether it was positive or negative for the Gram stain 	2 and 3- Rhizobacteria has been collected from different oilseed crops, if these crops are mentioned in title or abstract it will be too long title or abstract. So, the details of crops collected have been mentioned in table 1 in materials and methods and the table 1 is highlighted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The various types of literature that indicate the effective rhizobacteria as Bacillus sp. have been mentioned in results and discussion and are highlighted. - Highest potential values of inhibition against fusarium and mortality of nematode is given by these four rhizobacteria so, these rhizobacteria are taken for morphological and biochemical characterization. Gram statining of highly potential rhizobacteria is mentioned in table 4 and highlighted
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yeas	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issues