SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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	**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. **Introduction:** Good introduction Consider my comment in the text. **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? **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. **Discussion:** Your discussion is not good. Comment and explain your significant results in comparison with other works. **Conclusion** Your conclusion is good but this should be better if you make the other part clear **Reference:** Please revise your citations. Please refer to the journal guideline	.
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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Rostand Romeo Chamedjeu**
Department, University & Country	**Pan African University, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya**