

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104206
Title of the Manuscript:	In-vitro Efficacy of Native Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacterial Isolates Against Different Fungal Phytopathogens
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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it highlights the Assessment of In-vitro Efficacy of Native Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacterial Isolates Against Different Fungal Phytopathogens Yes, the title of the article is suitable. Yes. Yes, the manuscript is divided into appropriate subsections. Yes. The manuscript is scientifically correct. Yes, the references are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable but good quality. The parts highlighted in red in the paper need to be reframed so that they are more coherent. I have also suggested some grammatical corrections in color. There are some spelling mistakes. After corrected approved for publication.	
Optional/General comments	Few Corrections needed	

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:	Kamal Prasad
Department, University & Country	Xenesis Institute, Center for Advanced Agriculture Research, India