

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128883
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTAGONISTIC EFFECT OF TRICHODERMA AGAINST DIFFERENT PLANT PATHOGENS
Type of the Article	Scientific article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is important because it shows that local strains of mycoparasitic fungi like <i>Trichoderma</i> species are good candidates as biocontrol agents for agricultural important plants. It also shows the importance of searching for new BCAs that are adapted to particular soil and environmental conditions, in order to exert their benefits over the crops.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is suitable	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is understandable, but I suggest the authors should remark the importance of <i>Trichoderma</i> as a phytopathogen antagonist	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	It is correct in part. In the methodology section, authors indicate that they did the identification of the 4 <i>Trichoderma</i> isolates, but they do not report those results, they describe the morphology of each strain colony, but no mention of the <i>Trichoderma</i> specie. Authors only mention it about 1 strain in the conclusions. If the results are not in the main manuscript, maybe include them as supporting information. Also, there is no discussion of the results, just the description. Results discussion should include references supporting their findings, and the identification of the <i>Trichoderma</i> isolates is important for the discussion, so the authors can support their findings regarding the inhibition showed by each strain.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	I can't say the references are sufficient because the list of references is incomplete	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No. The quality of the language needs revision and edition. Authors use words that are not in accordance with the meaning they intent. For example: "principle crops" is not correct, the correct form is "main crops". It is not "arial mycelium", it is "aerial mycelium"	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please check the correct writing of the organisms' scientific names. Species and genera names should be in <i>italics</i> . Consider including photographs of the confrontations, they are more illustrative of the work. Elaborate a more precise conclusion of the work, according to the results discussion. Presentation and discussion of the results are very important, as well as a clear and precise conclusion based on the results discussion, please consider that. Also, consider a language revision and a general revision of the manuscript due to the lack of a complete list of references	

#### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Paulina Guzmán Guzmán</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Instituto Tecnológico de Morelia, Tecnológico, México</b>