

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_107670</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of halotolerant phosphate solubilizing bacterial treatments on the growth of mung bean, pea and wheat plants</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Full Length Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Phosphate-solubilizing bacteria (PSB) have the potential to make insoluble phosphate available to plants through <u>solubilization</u> and mineralization, increasing crop yields while maintaining environmental sustainability. Hence the manuscript is very important for scientific community.</li> <li>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</li> <li>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</li> <li>4. Yes, the structure of the article is appropriate.</li> <li>5. No, the "Discussion" is the integral part of the scientific studies. We not just only have to describe our results. In this manuscript the "discussion" is totally absent. Hence the manuscript is scientifically incomplete and incorrect.</li> <li>6. Not, the references are not sufficient and there is great need to add supporting and comparing references in the manuscript.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	Satisfactory	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Discuss your results and compare them with other scientists' findings.	

### 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:	<b>Bilqees Fatima</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Minhaj University, Pakistan</b>