

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	Preliminary study

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The author has used 4 samples of different plant rhizosphere. But the location was not mentioned in detail</p> <p>The title is ok</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>Certain subsections under materials and methods need to be introduced</p> <p>Methodology not clearly explained- quantitative analysis and production of asparaginase not clearly explained. Why the author used a fungal medium czapex dox in methodology and how he isolated bacteria?</p> <p>References are not very recent. They are not quoted in unique format.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Line number</th> <th>Reviewer's Comments/Suggestions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>17</td><td>Nesslerization spell check</td></tr> <tr><td>21</td><td>Soils- wrong spacing</td></tr> <tr><td>25</td><td>Enterobacter- E-capital</td></tr> <tr><td>28</td><td>Spelling of catalyzes</td></tr> <tr><td>29</td><td>Spelling of ammonia</td></tr> <tr><td>55</td><td>Incorrect punctuation</td></tr> <tr><td>92</td><td>A instead of an hot air oven</td></tr> <tr><td>93</td><td>Oven- spell check</td></tr> <tr><td>104</td><td>Bacteria instead of bacterias</td></tr> <tr><td>113</td><td>Spell-air dried</td></tr> <tr><td>122</td><td>Spell check real time</td></tr> <tr><td>131</td><td>Spell check inoculum</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Line number	Reviewer's Comments/Suggestions	17	Nesslerization spell check	21	Soils- wrong spacing	25	Enterobacter- E-capital	28	Spelling of catalyzes	29	Spelling of ammonia	55	Incorrect punctuation	92	A instead of an hot air oven	93	Oven- spell check	104	Bacteria instead of bacterias	113	Spell-air dried	122	Spell check real time	131	Spell check inoculum	
Line number	Reviewer's Comments/Suggestions																											
17	Nesslerization spell check																											
21	Soils- wrong spacing																											
25	Enterobacter- E-capital																											
28	Spelling of catalyzes																											
29	Spelling of ammonia																											
55	Incorrect punctuation																											
92	A instead of an hot air oven																											
93	Oven- spell check																											
104	Bacteria instead of bacterias																											
113	Spell-air dried																											
122	Spell check real time																											
131	Spell check inoculum																											
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language is appropriate for the study</p>																											
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Could have written in a methodical way.</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:	A Subhashini
Department, University & Country	Ethiraj College for Women, University of Madras, India