

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_98582
Title of the Manuscript:	Leveraging plant growth promoting rhizobacteria for sustainable agriculture and environment
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://journalajb2t.com/index.php/AJB2T/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for scientific community, because it is a review of the scientific literature on how plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) can contribute to reducing the need for toxic agrochemicals, promoting sustainable agricultural practices, it shows the use of PGPR as biocontrol agents, plant growth stimulators and bioremediators. 2. The title of the article is adequate corresponding adequately to the objective of this study. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive and contains essential information. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not very adequate, I advise you to review this article. Revision information is in the manuscript. 5. I think this manuscript needs to undergo the proposed revisions to become scientifically correct. 6. I consider the recent references and sufficient for this study. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The English language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	It is advisable to carry out a grammar review of the English language by a professional specialist.	

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:	Antônio Francisco de Sousa
Department, University & Country	E.E.E.P Dom Walfrido Teixeira Vieira, Brazil