

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98045
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of microbial inoculants for green house gases mitigation under low land rice ecosystem
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)	Comments 1. The document is interesting, it addresses an important issue, methane as a greenhouse gas, methane contributes to global warming. It provides knowledge in the techniques of field sampling and laboratory isolation of the strains of the organisms, production tests with mineral salts, I believe that they are important contributions in the knowledge of bioinoculants 2. The title is related to the topic, I think it is correct 3. The abstract does not indicate the general objective of the study, nor does it include a conclusion. 4. The subtopics are considered in the body of the document, although the methodology lacked a rigorous statistical analysis to support laboratory tests, the table they report is very basic and does not support the results 5. It is correct but there is a lack of statistical support 6. The references are sufficient but they are not updated, the most recent is from 2006. I think they will have to update with recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The English language is official, even if it is not the most appropriate, the technical information is reported in that language	

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:	Ricardo Gonzalez Mateos
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Guerrero, Mexico