

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95389
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation on effect of zinc solubilizing microorganisms on microbial population in soil in pigeonpea [Cajanus cajan] on vertisol
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.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)	1. The manuscripts written are still necessary for enough to support food security and agricultural development 2. The title of the article is in accordance with the contents 3. The abstract article is complete but it needs similarities in the contents of the research objectives and the factors that encourage this research to be carried out 4. The structure of the manuscript still needs additions and The script needs to be completed with fig and data 5. The script is correct but needs to be completed again 6.. Refrence is sufficient but it is better to use it and include five years from now the source of the theory	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The quality of the writing is quite good	
Optional/General comments	This article still needs improvement if it is published in a journal and need to check again the similarity of theoretical sources and 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anang Susanto
Department, University & Country	Merdeka University, Indonesia