

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_97500 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | BIOCONTROL POTENTIAL AND MECHANISM OF BACILLUS SPP. AGAINST PHYTOPATHOGENS: A MINI REVIEW |
| Type of the Article | REVIEW |

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>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) | 1.- Yes, an over view of the state of art is essential to give an vision of new areas of opportunity for development of new projects. 2.- yes 3.- No, it didn't represent all the information in text. 4.- No. 5.- Yes. 6.- No, there were references with more than 15 or 20 years old. The structure of subsections could be more compact, some sections only mentioned previous works but didn't develop it or explain the mechanism of action. In the antibiotic section it wasn't clear when are talking about the mechanism of action and when were you talking about each one of the antimicrobial peptides "in general". The structure of the antimicrobial peptides wasn't the same, some were extensive and other didn't say nothing. The use of antibiotics like synonymous of antifungal or antiviral isn't correct. Some explanations for the biological compounds didn't mention the direct effect against phytopathogens. There was a mix between the antimicrobial peptides section and culture control examples. The induction of resistance is a physics effect, itself is a section. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Some scientific names weren't in italics and some weren't correctly write. | |
| 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) | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Jonatan Carmen Rangel Nuñez |
| Department, University & Country | Universidad de Guanajuato, México |