

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_104693
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical Properties of Soils from Different Land Use Systems Influence on the Abundance of Actinomycetes Populations
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.journalsajrm.com/index.php/SAJRM/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The importance of the manuscript proposed for publication for the scientific community consists in the contribution of scientific information demonstrated and statistical about the influence of content in useful bacteria for the agricultural plants of the physicochemical properties of the soil, the areas of use of soils and their natural situation. The information provided by the authors completes the existing ones and gives indications for the farmers interested in the natural (biological) treatment of their soils. The research activities carried out by the authors can be repeated in time and space, and this information can be stored in databases. The databases thus obtained provide results regarding soil dynamics in time and space, being able to formulate forecasts and action plans to remedy some deficiencies.</p> <p>2. The title is good as the authors propose. I propose a variant if you help with something: "The influence of the soil's physicochemical properties and different land use systems on the Abundance of Actinomycetes Populations".</p> <p>3. Yes the abstract of the proposal is comprehensive. According to the requirements of the journal template, the abstract should not exceed 300 words. The abstract of the manuscript has 563 words therefore it should be reduced. Try to negotiate with the publisher.</p> <p>4. Yes the subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. From a scientific point of view, I believe that the activities are carried out correctly, the statistical analysis is appropriate, and the discussion and conclusions are supported by the results. The only problems that should be solved would be some photos containing: -like a soil lecture location in each category of use; -Photographs that show the soil taken for each category of use; -In order to increase the quality of the article, some graphic representations of the results would be useful, which would facilitate the understanding and speed of understanding, possibly contributing to the reduction of the text. As for the formulas, there is a general rule that requires that the mathematical variables have the same font, size and style, both in equations and in the text. Otherwise, it is considered variables that have different meanings. I pointed out these problems in the manuscript. Also in terms of mathematical formulas, it is indicated that they are numbered because it makes it easier to identify and reference formulas. The first formula that appears in the text of the manuscript (p. 7, up) seems to be incomplete, after the multiplication sign (which should be the one in the equation editor: × and no x), the equation ends.</p> <p>7. The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>However, it is advisable to check the sources and if they think it is the case, if they are not already in the references list, to introduce them.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Considering the deficiencies reported to 5., 1. and 6., as well as those expressed by notations on the text of the manuscript (attached to the review) it is recommended to publish the article after remedying the deficiencies notified.</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:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Research Development for Machines and Installations Designed for Agriculture and Food Industry , Romania