

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_108084
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Growth and Yield of Sweet Corn Plants (<i>Zea mays saccharata</i> Sturt) in Rainfed Land to Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) Bamboo Roots
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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)
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes, it is. But better if an amendment is made on almost all parts of the paper. To specify, the abstract, introduction, Methodology and result and discussion part of the paper needs major modification and is mandatory to amend based on the comments indicated on the main manuscript on each part to fit the standard of the journal and the demand of readers.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Somehow it is. But it has to be improved in a way that includes the statement of the problem, objectives and conclusion. Because the abstract should stand alone and transfer all the necessary information of the manuscript if someone wants to understand the overall content of the paper by reading the abstract.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. Starting from the introduction all of the subsections of this manuscript need improvements. For example, the introduction is not supported with relevant source/articles. The objective of the paper okay. The materials and methods part also need improvement based on the comments given on the main document. Additionally, the result and discussion part of the paper should be revised again.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	It is not correct. It is necessary to include and made improvement based on the comments and suggestions included from No1- 4 above and on the main body/manuscript.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	They are not sufficient mainly on the introduction part there is sufficient citation. Therefore, these parts shall be supported by recent and relevant sources. Additionally, there are a number of references which are not cited in the main body.	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	I have read the manuscript and forward my suggestions rationally and scientifically on each and every part. So, I would like to embolden my final comment, the paper should be revised and rewritten by incorporating all the comments indicated on each part for the betterment of the manuscript and to increase its acceptance for international authors	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, it is not suitable. Mainly the result and discussion and the materials and methods part is not written properly.	
Optional/General comments	The papers idea is necessary but it is not well written. The comments written on each part of the paper starting from the title to the final page should be incorporated before publication is made.	

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:	Endalkachew Baye
Department, University & Country	Salale University, Ethiopia