

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104042
Title of the Manuscript:	ROLE AND IMPORTANCE OF PGPR IN MODREN DAY AGRICULTURE BY IMPROVING SOIL RIZOSPHERE: 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.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)
<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>1. With the increase in world population the requirement of agriculture products are also increasing. PGPR has been shown to be an ecologically friendly method of improving agricultural yields by stimulating plant development via a direct or indirect process. Present study is important for the scientific community who are thriving to achieve the targets related to augmentation of agriculture crops.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. It is recommended to provide pointwise specific conclusions instead of a paragraph to facilitate the readers.</p> <p>4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct and having value to the relevant community.</p> <p>6. Sufficient references are provided however, there are few latest references used in the study. Therefore, it is suggested to provide more (latest within last 5 years) references covering the area pf research addressed in the present manuscript.</p> <p>It is recommended to improve the results and discussion section with the elaboration of obtained results and comparison of your findings with the studies done in the past.</p> <p>Manuscript is well written however, authors need to do above corrections before acceptance of paper. There are also few formatting and grammatical/typo mistakes kindly correct them. Example: sd "rhizobac-teria" correct or "rhizobacteria". Use correct bracket in reference cited " (Rijavec and Lapanje 2016]."</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Manuscript should be corrected for English grammar and language. Preferably by taking help from a native speaker.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Saleem
Department, University & Country	Jubail University College, Saudi Arabia