Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JABB_97019**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of co-inoculations with growth-promoting bacteria on soybean crop**
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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)*
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. Yes** The MS is regular type for evaluation of well known and widely reported phenomenon of role of microbe on the plant growth. The use microbial inoculations need to be investigated for their contribution to nutrient enrichment of grains as well as their multifarious and positive effects in crops. At the same time, the role of microbial inoculation in bio fortification and soil health are also being investigation subject. The newness can be attached to this by location specificity (technology may be new for study area), variation in the types of microbial strain used and innovative parameters measurements. Authors have to see for this. Reviewer keeps decision of acceptance of MS (with this data) entirely on the editor. The detail comments are mentioned below: **2. Yes** **3. Abstract:** • Aim need to be clear and well defined; What kind of evaluation is it? (Growth, yield, economics/quality parameter?). • Result should be written in statistical (significant/non-significant)way rather than using word "greaterest", "not affect" • Conclusion: write increase (or % increase) in best treatment over control. **4. Yes** **5. Yes** **6.** Strictly follow the reference writing style of journal. **Introduction: See comment in MS** **Material and methods:** • Provide information on crop management practices such as weed and water management; • Mention duration of crop at each different stages in bracket duing which observations were recorded. • As per the information provided, nitrogen (fertilizer) was not applied and only P and K was applied; So, is authors hypohtesized that, entire nitrogen requirement of soybean is supplied by microbes? • If nitrogen used, mention the quantity; • Soybean is treated with rhizobium; Is any seed treatment were made with Rhizobium? (in addition to selected microbes). • Author reproted that, " bacteria *Pseudomonas fluorescens* was not detected." Please check it once as *Bacillus* and *Pseudomonas* are most commonly genus reported in almost all types of soils. **Results and discussion:** • Nodulation is of Rhizobium. How it will be affected by the appplied microbial inoculation as treatment? • The results and discussion is well written; while the observations recorded were too routin for microbial inoculation studied and are widely reported. Observations such as nutrient concentration and uptake changes in soil microbial properties need to be studied. • No information on economics of crop cultivation was given (as one major objective of use of micrbial inoculation was also to reduce the cost involved in the nitrogenous fertilizer. Also cited by author in introduction section). • Figure 4 showed the yield level of 3000 to 4000 kg ha^{-1} (eve in control plot also); How is it obtained without any nitrogenous fertilizer? **Conclusion:** • Conclusion should be concise and objective specific; • Write in temrs of increase in yield or any important recoded parameter in best treatment over control (Use of term greatest result done not carrry any quantifiable	

	meaning). • Use of word ”sustainability will be suitable in conclusion sectiononly when study was conducted over longer period and multilocation trial. Avoid using such word in conclusion.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	See comments in MS	
Optional/General comments	-	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Amit A. Shahane**
Department, University & Country	**Central Agricultural University, India**