

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	Research

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>)

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)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes References are sufficient but needs modification The article is written well. However there are a few spelling errors in between. Needs to be corrected. For Eg. (Ammonia is shown as ammoia in few places). Like wise names of organisms need to start in capital word which is not followed at few places. That needs a thorough check. Key words could be increased to 5 to 6 from the present 4.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is scientifically well elaborated and needs no much major change.	
Optional/General comments	Last reference has different font compared to other references. Please check again for references.	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Venkatesh Kamath B
Department, University & Country	Manipal College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, India