

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99504
Title of the Manuscript:	Plant Growth-Promoting Activity of Pseudomonas aeruginosa OD13 in Tomato plant
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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. Finding solutions to promote plant growth is a concern of the scientific community and anecessity for solving socio-economic problems at the global level. Microorganisms are an easy and inexpensive way to solve these problems. In the introduction, the problem is defined and the solution specified together with a short bibliographic study. Abbreviations must be defined the first time they appear in the text (eg IAA, HCN...). The methodology is clear, well described and easy to reproduce, but it can be improved. I recommend specifying the standards (sub-sections 2.5 and 2.6) to which the results were reported. I also suggest adding the concentrations for the tested antibiotics. The results are concise. Figure 1 repeats the information in Table 1. Discussions regarding plant growth parameters should be included in sub-section 3.1. The discussions can be improved in sub-sections 3.4 2. The title is confusing. 3. The abstract is concise and includes the sub-sections required by the journal. 4. In general, the manuscript respects the structure imposed by the journal 5. The scientific data obtained are useful for the scientific world 6. There is a wide range of references, current but also older (improvements can be made).	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	-	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Borozan Aurica
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences "King Mihai I", Romania