

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_97574
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and screening of agriculturally important bacteria (PGPR) from organic sources of nutrient (Panchgavya, Jeevamrit and FYM) for future use
Type of the Article	Research

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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, this manuscript try to understand the importance of microbes present in organic plant nutrients. 2. Yes. But should explain about PGPR in the manuscript 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Need some improvements 6. Yes 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Deptt. Department of Basic Science, College of Forestry, Dr. YS Parmar University of Horticulture</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FYM should be expanded and explained where it is first used in the manuscript. The preparation of FYM also not mentioned so as readers may not understand the nutrition value of it. Since the nutrition present in it impact on microbial growth it is very important to mention <p>METHODOLOGY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. In introduction panchagavya was prepared by using ghee (one of the ingredients), but in methodology it was mentioned jiggery not ghee 3. In microbial isolation it was mentioned that 1g or 1ml of sample was added. Authors should clearly mention it is 1 gram or 1ml or 1ml contains 1g of sample 4. "...covered with a muslin or fine cloth to prevent the ...". Authors should clearly state either muslin or fine cloth, which one they were used? 5. Authors should explain which tests were used to identify which growth promoters in detail 6. Explain CD in statistics <p>RESULTS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. IAA details are missing / not clearly mentioned 8. Authors were done the morphological and biochemical tests, but missed to mention what are the bacterial colonies they have identified from the study <p>DISCUSSION</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>9. Authors should explain more about the results they have identified from their study, the important of this research work compared to the previous researchers, significant findings of the work/ results</p> <p>BAR CHART 10. Effect of different temperature, pH on the growth of selected bacterial isolates are given as chart, but not mentioned in the manuscript. And what is the necessity for using different temperature and pH, whereas it is used in the agricultural field which has fixed environmental condition. Also variation in these parameters also affects the plant growth. Detailed explanation need from the authors</p> <p>GENERAL QUERIES 11. Why there is no commercial / inorganic nutrients are used as (negative) control in this study? How the authors proving the importance of organic matters which better than artificial chemical manure?</p> <p>12. Authors only revealed about the beneficial bacteria, but not studied or mentioned about the pathogens found in organic nutrients. Benefits alone say, it is better than chemicals but have to prove it is free from/ less harmful bacteria.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Umadevi Subramanian
Department, University & Country	Bharathidasan University, India