Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_93798**
Title of the Manuscript:	**In vitro evaluation of biocontrol potential of Lactic acid bacteria isolated from natural ecosystem against plant pathogenic fungi.**
Type of the Article	**Short 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:

(https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy)

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	**Material and method** a) Under session 2.3, advice author describe the replication of the study with the mean and deviation. b) Under session 2.3.1, the formulae is unclear and require author further describe the calculation of inhibition zone. Not clear understanding in (R+r)(R-r). c) Under session 2.4, advice author describes 16S rRNA primer of interest clearly. Request author elaborates NCBI database clearer. d) Under session 2.5, statistical analysis protocol is not described clearly, what is the significance level of statistical study? Is significance difference interpreted in mean value? **Results and Discussion** a) The description of the findings is unclear and not conclusive. Suggest author determine the most effective inhibition among the pathogen cultures and decide which LAB exhibit the best inhibition activity in general. Request author rephrase the literature reviews quoted and justify the current findings with other studies being conducted. b) Advice author selects either Table or Figure as both exhibit the same result. c) Under session 3.2.2, the objective of the findings is not same as method stated under 2.3.2. d) How author select culture for molecular characterisation? Why were only LAB 22, LAB4, LAB24, LAB10 and LAB 29 selected for the study? e) How LAB isolates inhibit the growth of plant pathogen culture? Will it cause by acidity or production of active antimicrobial metabolite? **Conclusion** a) As author mention LAB exhibiting inhibition activity against pathogen culture, how effective LAB culture as compared to other isolates?	
Minor REVISION comments	Materials and method a) Under 2.2, advice author briefly describes the fungal cultivation methodology. b) Suggest author describe the equipment and media used in this study including the brand and country of manufacture. c) Under 2.3.1, pathogen inoculum concentration is not stated clearly. Advice author include the inoculum concentration, log CFU/mL understanding that the volume not cause the bias of the study. Advice author describe the size of the agar well used in this study. d) Under 2.3.2, the approach of the study is unclear. Does the study determine reduction of the mycelial mat by percentage? If it is so, the formulae are confusing and unclear as there is no pre-weighed mycelial disc written in the formulae. Result and Discussion a) As per protocol stated, culture inoculum was loaded into the agar well against the pathogen. As this sample is a mix of live culture and extract, which in which contribute to the inhibition activity causing the clear zone? Live culture or metabolites? General a) Why were only *P. aphanidermatum*, *F. oxysporium*, *S. rolfsii*, *R. solani* and *Alternaria sp.* selected for the study? How severe those plant pathogen culture cause the damage of the crop and the economic loss?	
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:	**Lee Fu Haw**
Department, University & Country	**Malaysia**