

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103858
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro compatibility of Trichoderma and Bacillus biocontrol agents with different fungicides
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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, addresses the co-use of biocontrol agents and fungicides for pathogen control.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>No, important information is omitted.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>This manuscript was revised up to page 4, line: "The compatibility of six fungicides at different concentrations with the fungal biocontrol agent <i>T. asperellum</i> is indicated in Table 1 and Figure 1." The absence of essential information made further revision a futile exercise.</p> <p>It is my opinion that authors must implement the following changes and resubmit the work.</p> <p>1. When analyzing table 1, and following tables, one verifies that the authors omitted in the Material and Methods the inclusion of important/essential information about the statistical methods used. Hence, it is mandatory that the information be explicitly included.</p> <p>2. The meaning of the letters (a, b, c,...) presented throughout the table is not clear, nor are they referred to in the legend.</p> <p>3. The legend of tables and figures are too synthetic and unable to stand alone from the main text. Please, create informative legends capable to stand being detached from the main text and still full inform about the object.</p> <p>4. The number of column of the tables can be reduced by half. The information they now present (radial growth, mm; Percentage of inhibition, %; and its square root) are three different ways of describing the same data, hence, redundant.</p> <p>5. Also, my suggestion that the authors do not repeat in the main text information already provided in the tables. You have the option, for example, of using, in less number of columns, the length of growth, the square root % and the respective statement of significance; and then, in the main text, present and discuss the results in terms of percentage growth in relation to the control.</p> <p>6. Also include in Material and Methods the procedure for data transformation presented in tables.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Henrique MAC Fonseca
Department, University & Country	University of Aveiro, Portugal