

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_97877
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of culture conditions for gibberellic acid production by Fusarium solani KUSF0301
Type of the Article	

### 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.journalasrj.com/index.php/ASRJ/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The manuscript presents relevant information on gibberellic acid (GA) by Fusarium sp. 2. yes 3. yes 4. yes 5. yes 6. just sufficient	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English is not my native language. However, the English used is adequate for a scientific publication, despite having a slight regional accent.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. The authors should consider the minor track changes introduce in the revised manuscript. 2. Also, the two comments there included (the criteria for inoculum selection; and the use of MF136401 as fertilizer).	

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Henrique MAC Fonseca
Department, University & Country	University of Aveiro, Portugal