

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_98992
Title of the Manuscript:	PLANT GROWTH PROMOTING- RHIZOBACTERIA (PGPR): THEIR POTENTIAL AS BIOFERTILIZER AND BIOPESTICIDE AGENTS . A REVIEW .
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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)
Compulsory 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	the manuscript is important due to the pollution in agricultural fields due to the rampant use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides. These agrochemicals cause great harm to human health The title of the manuscript is very attractive and very clear Good efforts were done, and the manuscript is written very well Based on the research gaps, I highly recommend writing the main research questions of the study at the end of the introduction. Please write the main limitation of the study or this method. The references are recent but from my point of view search for more recently.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	the language is very clear and easy to understand as scientific writing	
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:	Hanan Arief Hasan
Department, University & Country	Jerash University, Jordan