

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_110349
Title of the Manuscript:	Biological Control of Root knot Nematode, <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> Using Nematode Antagonist in Tomato
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes, this is an interesting study that addresses a topic of great interest to the scientific community, given the growing search for more sustainable alternatives in the control of plant-parasitic nematodes, such as the use of biocontrol agents. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract needs significant improvement. It is too superficial and does not mention the methodology of the study or provide the research objective. After the introduction, the results are presented in the text without any context, leaving the reader confused. Additionally, a conclusion is missing. The author has up to 300 words to write the abstract but has only used 147. Therefore, the abstract needs to be rewritten, and the missing information should be added. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? No. The subsections of the Material and Methods section need to be modified. There is only one subsection "<i>Nematode inoculum</i>" where the entire methodology of the study is included, and most of the described methodology is not related to the name given to the subsection. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. No. The references used in the text are insufficient and outdated, with the most recent one dating back to 2012, meaning more than ten years ago. The authors used few references in their manuscript, despite the existence of various recent works on the topic. Both in the introduction and in the Results and Discussion sections, excellent references could have been used to reinforce and strengthen the results obtained in this study, as well as to reaffirm its importance. Below are some suggestions for articles involving the biological control of root-knot nematodes that could be used in this manuscript: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sun X, Zhang R, Ding M, Liu Y, Li L. Biocontrol of the root-knot nematode <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> by a nematocidal bacterium <i>Pseudomonas simiae</i> MB751 with cyclic dipeptide. <i>Pest Manag Sci.</i> 2021 Oct;77(10):4365-4374. https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.6470 M.A. Radwan, S.A.A. Farrag, M.M. Abu-Elamayem, N.S. Ahmed. Biological control of the root-knot nematode, <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> on tomato using bioproducts of microbial origin. <i>Applied Soil Ecology</i> 56: 58-62, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2012.02.008. T. Benedetti et al. Microorganisms in the biological control of root-knot nematode: A metanalytical study. <i>Research, Society and Dev.</i>, v. 10, n. 6, 2021. http://dx.doi.org/10.33448/rsd-v10i6.15209. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes. The language of the article is suitable for scholarly communication and is well-written. I have made a few changes in the attached manuscript to enhance clarity.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	Although the subject of your study is definitely right for publication in this journal, I found that your manuscript need to be more structure. The introduction does not give enough information to engage the reader and make it of interest for them to want to read what your findings are. It also has only two citations, with the majority of the text providing only generic information, without actually delving into the object of its study. The methodology also presents issues... why were there only three repetitions for each treatment? This quantity reduces the reliability of the results due to the low number of repetitions. Information about statistical analysis is also missing. Why was no mean test conducted? On which software was the analysis of variance performed? The data analyses directly impact the obtained results, as relying solely on the mean, I cannot assert that one treatment is better than the other, as discussed. Therefore, I recommend that the author makes a major revision and modifications to his manuscript, taking into account the points questioned above.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Natalia de Jesus Ferreira Costa
Department, University & Country	Brazil