

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_109917
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Microbial Consortia Inoculation and Chemical Fertilizers on Growth Parameter and Nodulation of Soybean (<i>Glycine max L. merill.</i>) and Chickpea (<i>CicerarietinumL.</i>) Crop
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Manuscript could be a beneficial addition to the application of microbial inoculation, however the current status of manuscript requires serious improvement to make it appealing and attractive</p> <p>Title is appropriate according to the conducted work.</p> <p>The abstract lacks a clear topic because it has no true introduction lines, the study's goal is stated in the running title, and there is no brief explanation of the work's methodology. Nevertheless, the abstract provides a full explanation of the coil mineral analysis results, which appears unnecessary. The experiment's significant findings regarding the relevant parameters are not emphasized, and the abstract's lacks a conclusion.</p> <p>The main sections are okay, but the information inside every section (introduction, methodology, result and discussion) is redundant.</p> <p>The manuscript data should present with standard deviation and the difference among treatment groups represent in percentage or statistical differences through p-value.</p> <p>Lack of new updated references of relevant studies.</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>acceptable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction requires systematic revision, remove excessive information of soil nutrient, which is not target, add data about plant biometric development and nodule formation.</p> <p>Discussion is missing in respective section add discussion and present result on percentage or statistical basis.</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:	Aansa Rukya Saleem
Department, University & Country	Bahria University, Pakistan