

Manuscript Evaluation

Reviewer's Information

E-Mail:	hsukorini@yahoo.com
Title:	PhD
First Name:	Henik
Last Name:	Sukorini
Affiliation:	
Country:	Indonesia
Specialization:	Plant pathology, Microbiology

Manuscript Information

Manuscript Number:	AJMR-08.02.14-6699
Manuscript Title:	Bioefficacy of <i>Muntingia calabura</i> botanical formulation enhanced disease resistance in tomato plants against <i>Alternaria solani</i>
Date Sent To Reviewer:	10-04-2014
Date Expected From Reviewer:	24-04-2014

Evaluation Report

Kindly enter comments per section of the manuscript

<p>General comment:</p>	<p>The way to write need coordinate, many redundancies in introduction and in the method, result, and discussion. Many grammatically mistakes. Abstract and result should wrote in past tense (if as author's result). Abstract was more than 200 words. Major revision need to be good manuscript. The proper title should be Bioefficacy of Muntingin, a botanically..... Because in this paper the author didn't use pure muntingia sp extract but use muntingin 5EC and 4EC.</p>
<p>Introduction:</p>	<p>Fungicide was including insecticide. Redundancy in pesticide effect statement. Was muntingin as a previous author result? If yes, should be state about the advantages. If not, should state why the author used it? The objective was to evaluate root extract of M. calabura, but the author did with M calabura formulation (5EC and 4EC)</p>
<p>Methodology:</p>	<p>From where the author collected the plant? Or from where the material buy if commercial? How to prepare microbe? What the Muntingin 4 Ec and 5EC mean? Please explain how to make 4EC and 5EC. What design author used? What does statistical analysis method used? How to compare the data? Per cent or percent?</p>
<p>Results:</p>	<p>In the result part, it didn't need method explanation anymore, just state what the result. Should be used clear meaning....high and low temperature..(how) What is PO and PD?</p>
<p>Discussion:</p>	<p>Discussion part was not literature study part, the reference only need for supporting or using in against agument. How author knew that muntingin promoted the activity of seed enzyme? Was it from literature or another observation?</p>

Bibliography/References:	The author only had 1 new reference, others were under 2008. In this field many new references actually.
Others:	In Table only need percent reduction over control only to represent the result.
Decision:	Major revision

Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)

Originality:	2
Contribution To The Field:	2
Technical Quality:	3
Clarity Of Presentation :	4
Depth Of Research:	3

Recommandation

Kindly mark with an X

Accept As Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	
Requires Moderate Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	x
Submit To Another Publication Such As:	
Reject on grounds of (Please be specific)	

Additional Comments

Please add any additional comments (Including comments/suggestions regarding online supplementary materials, if any):

We welcome manuscripts edited by the following organizations:

JOURNALS CONSORTIUM (www.journalsconsortium.org)

EDITAGE (www.editage.com)

BIOEDIT (www.bioedit.co.uk)