

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104284
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and identification of L-asparaginase producing bacteria from soils of different agroclimatic zones of Jammu (J&K)
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript explores the bioprospection of microorganisms from different soil samples in the North-Western Himalayas for L-asparaginase enzyme production. Given the significance of L-asparaginase as a potential anti-cancer drug and the need for improved pharmaceutical characteristics, this study is relevant and important for the scientific community. The isolation and identification of a novel bacterial species, <i>Enterobacter aesburiae</i>, as a potential L-asparaginase producer, provides valuable insights for further research in the field of cancer therapeutics.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title "Isolation and Identification of L-Asparaginase Producing Bacteria from Soils of Different Agroclimatic Zones of Jammu (J&K)" is suitable as it accurately reflects the main focus of the study.</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a concise overview of the manuscript, summarizing the importance of L-asparaginase as an anti-cancer drug and the need for novel enzyme sources. It briefly describes the study's objective, methods, results, and characterization of the identified bacterial strain. Overall, the abstract is comprehensive, effectively conveying the key findings of the research.</p> <p>4. The manuscript follows a suitable structure with clear subsections. It includes sections such as Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. The Materials and Methods section adequately describes the procedures used for isolation, screening, and characterization of the bacterial isolates. The Results and Discussion section presents the findings concisely and relates them to existing knowledge. The Conclusion provides a concise summary of the study's outcomes. The manuscript's structure is appropriate and facilitates easy comprehension of the research.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in its methodology and findings. The study successfully isolated and identified a new bacterial species, <i>Enterobacter aesburiae</i>, with potential as a producer of L-asparaginase. The qualitative and quantitative screening for asparaginase activity was appropriately conducted, and the results were discussed in line with the study's objectives. The biochemical and molecular characterization further supported the identification of the bacterial strain. However, it is essential for the authors to ensure that the manuscript is thoroughly reviewed for any potential errors or inconsistencies before final publication.</p> <p>6. The References are considered sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Based on the provided content, the language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript's text is clear, understandable, and appears to follow standard conventions of academic writing. The sentences are well-structured, and the technical terminology is used appropriately, indicating a good grasp of scientific language.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Priambodo Nur Ardi Nugroho
Department, University & Country	Politeknik Perkapalan Negeri, Indonesia