



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_55259
Title of the Manuscript:	Insights into the Metabolites Conferring Pathogenicity of Xanthomonas oryzae and its inhibition by Trichoderma longibrachiatum EF5
Type of the 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	<p>Abstract: Your abstract is not well structure. You should present the context of your study with the key founding and recommendation. It should stand into one paragraph of 300 words Revise your key words.</p> <p>Introduction: Good introduction Consider my comment in the text.</p> <p>Methodology: This is the most important part. What you presented is not clear at some point. What was the experimental design used for antagonistic assay? Number of replicates? What type of data was collected and how did you analyse them? Using which software?</p> <p>Results: It would be better to separate your results from discussion. From what you presented is not easy to appreciate the quality of your work. Where are the data for the antagonistic assay? Revise your methodology to be in line with the results part.</p> <p>Discussion: Your discussion is not good. Comment and explain your significant results in comparison with other works.</p> <p>Conclusion Your conclusion is good but this should be better if you make the other part clear</p> <p>Reference: Please revise your citations. Please refer to the journal guideline</p>	<p>Changes were made in the abstract</p> <p>Comments were considered and required changes were made</p> <p>Methodologies were changed CRD with three replications were used Observing the colony growth to analyse the efficacy</p> <p>Data for antagonist was included and made n line with methodology</p> <p>Efficacy of <i>T. longibrachiatum</i> EF5 metabolites was used to study its potential against the growth of <i>X. oryzae</i> pv. <i>oryzae</i>. These metabolites inhibited the growth of Xoo under <i>in vitro</i> screening. Further, the metabolites composition of Xoo was identified using GC-MS technique to know the type of compounds and its function.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	