

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_116718
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of indigenous isolates of biocontrol fungi and bacteria against <i>Macrophomina phaseolina</i> causing root-rot fungus in green gram
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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>In the title change replace the word 'root rot fungus' with 'root rot disease'</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author has described the isolation and identification of root rot fungus in material and methods section. However, the results of isolation and identification is not mentioned in results and discussion part. Has the author proved the pathogenicity of the isolate <i>Macrophomina phaseolina</i> ? 2. Author has taken up the isolation <i>Aspergillus niger</i> as biocontrol agents. What are all the tests conducted to differentiate this particular isolate of <i>A. niger</i> (biocontrol isolate) from saprophytic/aflatoxin producing <i>A. niger</i> which normally present in soil. 3. In material and methods section, the detailed steps of serial dilution and plating technique in mentioned. This may not be required as it is a very basic and standard protocol being followed in isolation of microorganisms from different samples 4. The identification steps/keys/methods followed for isolated biocontrol agents is not described in results/discussion section 5. In Table 1, the colony diameter of biocontrol agents is mentioned. What is the rationality of including this parameter in demonstrating the effectiveness of biocontrol agents against <i>M. phaseolina</i>. In fact, the calculation of growth inhibition is solely on the growth measurement/colony diameter of pathogenic fungus in control and treated (dual plate) plates. The colony diameter of biocontrol agents doesn't have any significance in elucidating the effectiveness of biocontrol agents against pathogen in dual plate technique. 6. Include few photographs showing the efficacy of biocontrol agents against pathogen in dual plate technique. 7. In conclusion, author has mentioned as 'Biocontrol fungi and bacteria are effective alternatives to synthetic fertilizers and fungicides'. Does the current study/experiment give any information on biocontrol agents in relation to synthetic fertilizers? 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments	--	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raghunandan B.L.
Department, University & Country	Anand Agricultural University, India